

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXX, No. 22
WHOLE No. 755

March 15, 1924

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	511-514
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Catholics and the English Labor Party— Guardians of the Holy Places—Lectures and Lecturers—New York's Tercentenary—Which is the Better Woman?.....	515-521
COMMUNICATIONS	522-523
EDITORIALS	
Public Office and Private Gain—Are We Learning?—The Real Remedy—Books and Reading—Mr. Volstead and the Angels.....	524-526
LITERATURE	
Imitation and Recognition in Art—Nazareth— Reviews—Books and Authors.....	526-530
EDUCATION	
Peaches, Apples and Teapots.....	530-531
SOCIOLOGY	
Oil and the Cooperative Movement.....	531-532
NOTE AND COMMENT.....	533-534

Chronicle

Home News.—A serious state of affairs seems to be developing at Washington. With many wild rumors flying about, Senators show themselves extremely nervous on

Senatorial Investigations

the floor of the Senate and the newspapers contain sinister hints of still worse revelations to come in the investigations now going on. After the first set of telegrams addressed to Mr. McLean at Palm Beach were read into the record, the employees of Mr. McLean who had sent the dispatches were called to explain them. Government experts deciphered those which were in code, and it was found that one of the codes used was an old one in use in the Department of Justice. Nothing of any value bearing on the Fall case seems to have been elicited. Meanwhile, a new inquiry was instituted for the purpose of investigating the Department of Justice, and Senator Brookhart was named chairman. At the same time rumors were heard that oil men in America had instigated the revolt in Mexico, and Leonard Wood, Jr., stated that his father had been offered the Republican nomination in Chicago in 1920, if he were willing to name a certain politician as Secretary of the Interior. Meanwhile, hardly any Congressional appropriation measures have thus far been considered except in the committees.

Mutual concessions have been made by the contracting parties in the Ship Liquor Treaty recently concluded between the United States and Great Britain. The principle

The Ship Liquor Treaty

of the three-mile territorial limit, for which Great Britain has contended in recent years, is upheld in Article I of the treaty. An exception to this three-mile zone is conceded in Article II; by section 1 of this Article, the permission is granted to American officials to board and examine private vessels under the British flag suspected of carrying alcoholic beverages in violation of the laws of the United States; section 2 grants the right to seize and take into port for adjudication the suspected vessels; the rights conferred by the two preceding sections may be exercised, according to section 3, within the distance that can be traversed in one hour by the vessel suspected of endeavoring to commit the offense. Article III represents a concession made by the United States to the effect that liquors listed as sea stores or cargo for a port foreign to the United States may be carried into the territorial waters provided that such liquors shall be kept under seal continuously while the vessel is in the territorial waters. For the settlement of any claims by British vessels for compensation on the ground that they have suffered loss or injury through the unreasonable or improper exercise of the rights granted above, Article IV prescribes that the claims be referred to the joint consideration of two persons, one of whom shall be nominated by each of the contracting parties. Before taking effect, however, the treaty must be ratified by the Senate.

Official confirmation has been given to the report that Archbishop Hayes of New York and Archbishop Mundelein of Chicago are to be created Cardinals at the secret

Two New American Cardinals

Consistory to be held on March 24. With the elevation of these two prelates to the Cardinalate, the United States will rank fourth among the countries having representatives in the Sacred College, Italy, Spain and France having a greater number. Archbishop Hayes, the first Archbishop native to the old city of New York, was born in 1867. He attended Manhattan College, St. Joseph's Seminary and the Catholic University of America. He was ordained in 1892, and after serving as curate and secretary to the then Bishop Farley, became chancellor when that prelate succeeded to the Archbishopric of New York. He was appointed Auxiliary Bishop of New York in 1914,

and in 1917 became Bishop Ordinary of the United States Army and Navy Chaplains. Archbishop Hayes was promoted to the See of New York on March 10, 1919. Most Reverend George W. Mundelein, D.D., Archbishop of Chicago, was born in New York in 1869. He was a pupil at Manhattan College, attended St. Vincent's Seminary, Beatty, Pa., and completed his studies at the Urban College of Propaganda, Rome. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1895. For three years he was assistant secretary to Bishop McDonnell, and became chancellor of the Brooklyn Diocese in 1898. He was elevated to the dignity of Domestic Prelate by his Holiness Pius X in 1906, and two years later received the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology from the Congregation of the Propaganda. In 1909 he was consecrated Titular Bishop of Loryma and Auxiliary Bishop of Brooklyn, and on December 9, 1915, was promoted to the See of Chicago.

Canada.—Though couched in the most general terms, the speech from the throne delivered by Lord Byng, Governor General of Canada, at the opening of the Canadian

The Parliament covers most of the main points which the present legislative session must discuss. After an in-

troductory summary of the causes for gratification in the growing prosperity of Canada, Lord Byng declared that the Government considered the question of the reduction of taxes as of prime importance. The Government, he stated, was prepared to exercise the strictest economy in the administration of public affairs, and felt confident that it would be able to announce before the end of the present fiscal year that for the first time since 1913 the national budget had been balanced. If this forecast proved correct, he promised that there would follow an immediate and radical diminution of taxes. Particular stress was laid by Lord Byng on the necessity of a greater spirit of national union; the present barriers which were so effectively separating Western Canada from the East were due in large measure to the contradictory tariff demands of the country, and with the settlement of this question he hoped that a more effective cooperation towards national prosperity would be attained. His Excellency briefly referred to the projected improvement of the waterways, the stabilization of the Canadian National Railway, and the final report which would be presented on the proceedings of the Imperial Conference held in London. While the address, in the subsequent sessions of Parliament has not been the subject of any severe criticism on the part of the opposition, it is considered by the Conservatives as inadequate and incomplete. The Liberal Government of Prime Minister King, being in a minority to the Conservative and Progressive oppositions, has a very slight tenure of power. Its continuation in office depends on its ability to obtain the support of the Progressives. Mr. Robert Forke, leader of the Progressives in the House, realizing this has declared that

his party will support the Prime Minister only as long as he acts in accord with the platform of the Progressive Party.

Czechoslovakia.—The strategic battle grounds on which the adversaries of Catholicism are at present waging their *Kulturkampf* against the Catholic Church are the elementary schools. Here the Church is handicapped by laws and ordinances that at best are indifferent to her inter-

ests. The Czech Catholic children are constantly persecuted by anti-Catholic teachers. During the past month some very important statistics were issued by the Government Statistical Bureau, showing the religious allegiance of the children and teachers in the elementary schools, as it stood on December 31, 1921, after the changes brought about by the agitation which preceded the census of February 15, 1921. In the first place the data given reconfirm the known fact that among the non-Czech portion of the population there was almost no shifting in religious allegiance. Secondly, they throw a glaring light on the situation in the Czech schools, making plain the immense favoritism shown children and teachers of certain denominations. Thus a disproportionately great number of teachers is allowed the non-Catholic denominations. The data bearing upon Catholics and those of "no religious denomination" reveal the real discrimination exercised against the Church. Here are some tell-tale statistics:

Czech elementary schools in Bohemia:

Catholics:	
Children	72.25 per cent
Teachers	54.70 per cent

No religious denomination:	
Children	12.62 per cent
Teachers	30.00 per cent

Czech elementary schools in Moravia:

Catholics:	
Children	91.17 per cent
Teachers	71.20 per cent

No religious denomination:	
Children	1.50 per cent
Teachers	17.70 per cent

Czech elementary schools in Silesia:

Catholics:	
Children	84.30 per cent
Teachers	68.20 per cent

No religious denomination:	
Children	2.46 per cent
Teachers	19.60 per cent

In order to understand these figures fully it must be borne in mind that under the Austrian Regime there was only a mere handful of non-Catholic teachers, because the teachers had to be of the same religious denomination as the majority of the children and this majority was almost always Catholic. The legislation after the declara-

tion of independence ostensibly removed the consideration of religious allegiance.

Hence Catholic elementary teachers, no matter of what nationality, constituted almost the entire teaching force in those three parts of the Republic. In regard to the teachers of nationalities other than Czech, the situation has remained almost unchanged, but in the Czech elementary schools there are at present only 54.70 per cent Catholic teachers in Bohemia, in Moravia, 71.20, and 68.20 per cent in Silesia. This number is in no proportion to the percentage of Catholic children in those three regions. But worst of all, the non-Catholic teachers of the Catholic children are with hardly an exception militant apostates. Solidly aligned over all the country, well organized, with a highly developed press, and conscious of powerful protection, they attack the Catholic religion in and out of school and persecute the Catholic children who generally constitute the majority of their pupils. The best that can in any case be said of the education received by Catholic children is that it begets religious indifference. Even of those teachers who have remained within the Catholic Church it may be said that only a small portion are real practising Catholics. Where such are to be found they give but little evidence of their religion in their educational work. They desire "not to hurt the religious feelings of any child of another religious denomination." Such indeed is the demand of the law, but non-Catholic teachers in general do not feel bound to observe the law in this respect. In consequence an intolerable situation has developed in the elementary schools. In the secondary school conditions are not much better. Hence the desire of Catholics to have State-supported denominational Catholic schools for Catholic children becomes more intelligible. But the way to the realization of this desire, they feel, will be long, steep and thorny.

Great Britain.—While friendly in spirit, the contents of the recent notes exchanged between Prime Minister MacDonald and Premier Poincaré are characterized as most frank in statement. The correspondence is in perfect accord with Mr. MacDonald's profession of open diplomacy and confirms likewise his expressed desire of establishing a more amicable basis for negotiations with France. Though there are in the British and French notes certain points of agreement, the viewpoints of the two Premiers show wide divergence. Mr. MacDonald, throughout his letter, insists on the need of a close cooperation between France and Great Britain. With such a union obtained, the rest of Europe will be gradually stabilized and the intervention of the United States may be confidently expected. In his strictures on French policy, Mr. MacDonald professes merely to express the views and desires of his own countrymen and to portray public opinion. Under this aspect, he cites the opinion that "France is endeavoring to create a situation which gains for it what it failed to get during the allied peace negotiations." He professes,

*French and
British Notes*

however, a sympathetic understanding of the French attitude of seeking an adequate safeguard and security. Nevertheless, he declares that the British people

regard with anxiety what appears to them to be the determination of France to ruin Germany and to dominate the Continent without consideration of our reasonable interests and the future consequences to a European settlement; that they feel apprehensive of the large military and aerial establishments maintained not only in eastern but also in western France; that they are disturbed by the interest shown by your Government in the military organization of the new States in Central Europe, and, finally, that they question why all these activities should be financed by the French Government in disregard of the fact that the British taxpayer has to find upwards of £30,000,000 a year as interest upon loans raised in America, and that our taxpayers have also to find large sums to pay interest on the debt of France to us, to meet which France has herself as yet neither made nor propounded, so far as they can see, any sacrifice equivalent to their own.

Such popular sentiments, Mr. MacDonald conceded, may be erroneous, but they are factors which must be taken into consideration. It should be the purpose of the two Governments therefore to allay suspicions and to consider these and the cognate problems in a spirit of sympathy and cooperation. In his reply, Premier Poincaré, though expressing his agreement with Mr. MacDonald both as to the questions to be settled and the methods to be employed, is very explicit in his defense and justification of the matters to which the British Premier found objection. He denies that France is seeking the political or economic annihilation of Germany, that she "has ever dreamed of annexing a particle of German territory or of turning a single German into a French citizen," and that she has never sought anything that was not recognized to be hers by the treaty. M. Poincaré is likewise frank in his denial of the fact that the French military and aerial establishments are in any way directed against England, or that the French policy towards the Little Entente should in any way give umbrage to England. Before concluding, he defends the French occupation of the Ruhr as a measure necessary "to induce Germany to settle with us and to conquer the stubborn resistance of the German industrial magnates."

India.—That the Labor Government of Great Britain does not intend to make any greater concessions to the Indian Nationalists than did its predecessor, the Conservative Government, is clear from the statements made in the House of Lords by the Secretary for India, Lord Olivier.

*Proposed
Conference
Rejected*

Recently the Swarajists sent in a demand to the British Government for the immediate establishment of a round-table conference to reconsider the present Constitution of India. By the terms of the present law such a conference is to be held in 1929. Speaking in the name of the Labor Government, Lord Olivier declared that the proposed round-table conference between the Government in India and the many Indian factions, if held at this time, "would be worse than perilous, indeed, big with disaster for the

people of India." He argued that it was useless to hope for any kind of agreement between the leaders of the Indian parties; he suggested that such a conference could only result in emphasizing the antagonism and the intolerance which now exists between the masses of Hindus and Moslems. Meanwhile, in India the Swarajists are clamoring for the establishment of what they call a responsible Government and are continuing their policy of obstruction to the present Government.

Reparations Question.—Aside from the German bank plan which has now been completed by the Committee of Experts little progress has been made in any definite way.

*Experts' Plans
for New Bank*

This is due to the fact that the Committee is not yet prepared to make its public announcements on the larger issues of the reparations question. As for the new banking plan itself, General Dawes has been assured of the readiness of the German Government to accept it as drafted. In substance this plan has already been explained here. The bank is to be a private institution, completely independent of the German Government, and its gold reserve to be kept safe from seizure by being kept outside the Reich. Its capital of 400,000,000 gold marks practically constitutes all that is left of the gold reserve of the old Reichsbank. According to the New York Times cable the gold reserve of the new bank is to be 1,200,000,000 gold marks, of which one-third is the gold of the Reichsbank, another third is to be subscribed in Germany, and the last third to be raised abroad by the sale of stock. The Board of Directors will be named by the banks of issue of all the large nations, including the United States Federal Reserve Bank. The German Government on its side is to lend the full machinery of the Reichsbank with its 400 branches, since the real business of the bank is to be conducted within Germany itself. It is apparently still uncertain whether its chief office will be in Holland or Switzerland. The first issue of the bank is to be in paper money to the amount of three billion gold marks, on the base of a gold reserve of forty per cent. This will be exchanged against the rentenmark at its market value, and against the present old German paper marks at the rate of about three billion for one gold mark. This implies that the old German mark has sunk to something like thirteen billions to one American dollar.

Turkey.—On March 4 the Turkish National Assembly took a step which is one of the most significant and far-reaching events of recent times. It was nothing

*End of the
Caliphate*

less than the abolition of the Caliphate of Islam. The Caliph was the spiritual head of all the Moslems in the world. His office is now abolished by the Turkish republic. This is the second step of the great revolution that is now taking place in Turkey under the leadership of the Presi-

dent of Turkey, Kemal Pasha. The first step in this revolution took place two years ago when the office of Sultan of Turkey was abolished and the State of Turkey declared a republic, by the Grand National Assembly of the country at Angora. The victories over the Greeks and the Treaty of Lausanne confirmed this action. Observers in Turkey state that the Government is determined on a complete reconstruction on the model of the Western states, and after the establishment of a republic, the second step, now taken, is the separation of religion from the State. For centuries the Ottoman throne was identified with spiritual supremacy over all Mohammedans in the world. The severance of this relation, while a natural consequence of recent events, has astonished the western world, for it was the possession of the spiritual Mohammedan headship in Constantinople which has always been looked on as the trump-card of the Turks in all relations with England and France, who have many Mohammedan subjects. In all their relations with Turkey these two countries have always been hampered by the fear of what the Caliph might do with the Mohammedans of Asia and Africa, if Turkish demands were not met. In throwing away this advantage the Turks are probably merely recognizing the fact that it is no longer needed, as they achieved through its use at Lausanne all the political advantages which they sought. The next step to be taken is said to be the definite eradication of religion from the law courts and the schools, and the confiscation of all religious property, valued, it is said, at \$500,000,000. This definite attack on their ancient religion by the Turks will have effects that nobody can foresee. Deprived of its headship and of the protection of the only real Mohammedan nation, the Mohammedan religion will probably lose whatever unity it seemed to have, and break up into national units. Already there are three claimants for the Caliphate. The Amir of Afghanistan, the King of the Hedjaz and the King of Egypt have laid claim to the office. Under the influence of England and France, who are vitally interested, it is probable that more than one of these will proclaim themselves head of the Mohammedans.

In AMERICA for March 22, Mr. Charles A. McMahon of the N. C. W. C. discusses in his usually frank manner our great immigration problem.

Mr. Thomas F. Meehan, veteran writer, gives some interesting data about the two American prelates who will soon be numbered among our American Cardinals.

The Washington correspondent of AMERICA writes in his interesting way about Sir Esmé Howard, England's first Catholic ambassador to the United States.

Catholics and the English Labor Party

A HILLIARD ATTERIDGE

NOW that Parliament is in session a few words about various features pertaining thereto will not be out of place.

Catholics are represented in all three parties, and a most satisfactory feature of the elections was that, all over the country, Conservative, Liberal and Labor candidates in response to the questions put to them by Catholic organizations gave, in the vast majority of instances, perfectly clear and satisfactory pledges that they would support an education policy of fair play for our Catholic schools. Only one candidate, H. G. Wells, made an attack upon Catholic education, in his election address, as a candidate for London University. It is a pleasure to note that he ended at the bottom of the poll. Until very recent years in many constituencies traditional anti-Catholic prejudice made it a difficult matter to obtain from candidates satisfactory pledges on the education question, and in almost all of them the return of a Catholic member was practically impossible. In those days, it was only a few years ago, Catholics in England had to rely for the defense of their schools on the solid phalanx of Nationalist members sent to Westminster from Ireland. Indeed many English Catholics opposed concessions to Ireland on the ground that Home Rule would leave the Catholic schools without any defenders in the House of Commons. But the results of the recent General Election show that the whole situation in Great Britain has altered in favor of the Catholics. Catholicism is no longer a bar to a candidate's election in any of the three parties and there is further a general recognition of the right of Catholics to fair treatment for their schools in any national system of education.

In all twenty-two Catholics have been elected in Great Britain. Of these one, the veteran T. P. O'Connor, is a Nationalist, three are Liberals, seven Conservatives, and eleven Labor representatives. The Labor party thus has the largest Catholic contingent, and moreover its success was helped in many constituencies by a large Catholic vote. In the last ten years there has been a marked rally of the Catholics in England to the Labor party. On both sides there has been an evolution of opinion and a clearing of ideas since the early days of the Labor movement, when so many of its leaders were still swayed by old prejudices and influenced by the widely accepted misstatements that the Church was on the side of the rich against the poor and maintained "the right divine to govern wrong." Catholics, on the other hand, too often confused the Labor program of social reform with revolutionary Communism. The Labor party in England has pub-

licly rejected the Communist theory. Nowhere has the party and its leaders been more bitterly attacked than in the newspapers of the Communist group. There however was at one time a serious possibility of a permanent break between the Catholics in the Labor movement and the official organization of the party. For a while in the years before the war, the annual Trades Union Congress included in its Labor program secular education and an extension of the divorce law. These items were eliminated from the party policy by the persistent action of a group of Catholic trades unionists, led by James Sexton (now member of Parliament for St. Helen's, Lancashire), the secretary of the Liverpool Dock Workers. He pointed out that without this revision of the party program Labor would lose the support of the great mass of Catholic workers in the North, who would otherwise support it, and feel that in so doing they were acting on the teaching of Leo XIII's famous encyclical on labor.

Catholic study of social questions has undoubtedly rallied a considerable mass of votes to the Labor cause. After the war the party won new adherents by a considerable widening of its basis. It declared that it was no longer a mere trades union development, but that it sought the support, not of one class, but of all "workers with hand and brain." This rallied to it numbers of what are called the "educated classes," and its supporters and leaders now include university graduates, professional men, not a few masters of industry; many who have served the State in various capacities and some sons of titled families. But the main strength of the party still consists of the working class though it has repudiated the idea of a class war.

Its Catholic members in the new House of Commons nearly all come from the working class. They are a remarkable group. Most of them have had a useful training in local government in municipally elected bodies. T. Gavan Duffy, secretary of the Iron Ore Workers, who has been elected at Whitehaven, has been for years a member of the Board of Guardians of the Poor in that town. J. J. Jones, who represents Silvertown, began life as a builder's laborer and is this year Mayor of the London borough of West Ham. J. L. Toole, now member for South Salford, is a justice of the peace and a member of Manchester City Council. He started as a newspaper-seller in the streets of Manchester, and then became a foundry worker. J. Wheatley of Glasgow began to work in a coal mine at eleven years of age. He has been for more than ten years a member of Glasgow City Council and a magistrate. Another miner is J. Sullivan, member for South Lanark, president of the Lanarkshire Miners' Union, and a member

of Lanark County Council. Yet another who began work as a boy in the coal mines is the member for Leigh in Lancashire, Joseph Tinker who has been for four years a member of St. Helen's Town Council. James O'Grady and James Sexton have been prominent in the Labor organization and the House of Commons for some years. O'Grady was employed by the Government on a mission to Russia to arrange for the release of war prisoners. He takes an active part in many Catholic works in South London. Sexton began his working life as a sailor-boy and was then for some years a docker at Liverpool. He is a self-educated man, who has three or four books and a couple of plays to his credit. He speaks well, and in the last session impressed the Commons by his eloquent opposition to Lord Birkenhead's new divorce law. J. P. Gardner of Hammersmith, West London, belongs to the furnishing trade and has long been active in local affairs. James Marley, who won a seat in North London, is a teacher in the schools attached to the Dominican Church. W. H. Egan of Birkenhead, has worked for most of his life in Laird's Shipyards there, and gives his leisure time to Catholic activities. He ended his speech after his victory at the election by asking all present to pray for him that he might have God's help to do his duty well as their representative.

The Labor party has made wonderful progress in recent years. It was officially organized only in 1900, when it had just two members in the House of Commons. By 1909 the number had risen to thirty-three. In the last Parliament it was 143. In the new House of Commons it musters 192. Its leader, Ramsay MacDonald, now Prime Minister, has made his mark already in Parliament. He is a level headed practical man, the very opposite of the revolutionary anarchist type. Like several other prominent men in his party he has an earnestly religious element in his character. He respects the ideals of his Catholic colleagues. In a recent speech he reminded his hearers that he had traveled in a good many countries and told them that everywhere he had been "greatly impressed by one thing—namely the love and reverence of the people in the Catholic churches."

Guardians of the Holy Places

A. FRANÇOIS

IN the summer of 1923 Archbishop Panteleimon of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Jerusalem came to the United States in search of funds to liquidate the debts of the Patriarchate. At first there was great difficulty in collecting enough money even to support the Archbishop while he was in this country. But as a result of Colonel Barrow's visit here, and of the consequent interest he aroused in the matter, particularly among the High Church Episcopalians, an American "Committee on Preservation of the Sacred Places in the Holy Land" was formed in New York with Haley Fiske as treasurer.

This committee, which is composed of about 120 prominent Protestants representing great wealth and influence, proposes to raise a sum of money sufficient to relieve the Greek Patriarchate of its present financial embarrassment. Before 1914, sixty-four per cent of the income of the Patriarchate was derived from Russian land-holdings and from the offerings of Russian pilgrims. The War and the Revolution cut off this income. Then the Patriarchate began to borrow money. As security for these loans were offered the land holdings in Palestine itself. The Patriarchate is unable to pay its interest, apparently, and if the loans were to be called it would lose everything. This disaster has so far been warded off because the British Mandatory Government has declared a moratorium. It is understood that to pay the loans about \$3,000,000 will be necessary.

As a first step towards realizing this sum the committee in question issued an appeal entitled: "Sharing the Custodianship of the Sacred Places." In this appeal Americans are asked to help the Orthodox Patriarchate to extricate itself from its financial difficulties on the grounds that Christendom is under "peculiar obligations to the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem, which through the centuries has been the custodian of the Sacred Places in the Holy Land." The places mentioned are Bethlehem, Nazareth, the Mount of Olives, Gethsemane, Calvary, and the Holy Sepulcher. "These places," it is said, "have been cared for and maintained by the Patriarchate of Jerusalem," "for more than 1,600 years," "for the benefit of Christianity throughout the world." "Through centuries of strife and turmoil in the world, this great institution has been faithful to its sacred trust, maintaining and preserving the shrines."

These and like assertions might lead persons of little historical knowledge to infer that the Orthodox Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem has been the sole guardian of the Holy Places for ages and the only body now charged with their care. All that the Latin Church has done in the past and is still doing for the preservation and maintenance of the Holy Places is entirely ignored in the appeal by the American committee. It is made to appear that in Palestine the Greek Patriarchate alone represents Christendom. The custody of the Holy Places was committed to the Franciscans early in the fourteenth century, and since that time the friars have never ceased to celebrate the Latin Mass and Offices there and to give protection, shelter and hospitality to pilgrims. In this office the Greeks have only alternative rights with the Latins and Armenians at the Holy Sepulcher and adjoining places, and some of these rights were not acquired by the Greeks and Armenians until after the great fire of 1808.

In order to fulfil the purpose of the above appeal, it was decided by the committee to invite the cooperation of all Protestant bodies, religious, educational, fraternal and so forth, in the organization of a campaign to be known as the "ninth crusade." This decision is set forth

in an "outline of a plan of procedure for the greater New York section of the American committee on preservation of the Sacred Places in the Holy Land." In this outline the purpose of the campaign is stated to be "to raise a sum of money sufficient to relieve the Patriarchate of Jerusalem of its financial embarrassment and thus preserve the Sacred Places to Evangelical Christianity." (Italics inserted.) The movement is to be carried on in such a way "that the plight of the Guardian of the Sacred Places and the danger of their being lost to the Evangelical Churches may be vividly dramatized." For this purpose a week was set in which the drive was to be made for the money. Aside from the fact that the Freemasons have been actively interested in this campaign, it is feared that the whole Protestant movement to aid the Greek Patriarchate will take on a definitely anti-Catholic character.

It was announced in New York that the Greek Patriarchate was willing to give the American committee an active share and joint control in the Greek Custodianship of the Holy Places. In point of fact the Greek Patriarchate has no authority whatsoever to make any such offer, for the simple reason that no part of the custodianship of the Holy Places is in its gift. This is evident from the terms of the *Statu Quo* drawn up in 1850, which regulates the rights of the different religious bodies in respect to the sanctuaries in Palestine, and which cannot be modified in the slightest detail without the formal consent of the Catholic Powers. There is not the slightest prospect, therefore, that the American committee will be given any active share or joint control in the Greek Custodianship of the Holy Places.

The British Mandate for Palestine, Article 14, provides that a "special commission shall be appointed to study, define and determine all rights and claims in connection with the Holy Places." After this commission begins its work it is very probable that the Catholic Powers may demand what in 1757 they demanded from Turkey, namely, the return of the Holy Places to the earlier *Statu Quo*, which was legally established in the fourteenth century. If they make good such a claim, it would mean that there would be returned to the Franciscans exclusive possession of several places which they held up to the eighteenth century; for instance, the Basilica of the Nativity at Bethlehem and the Tomb of the Blessed Virgin.

In connection with the drive for money for the Greek Patriarch, it may be worth while to quote the following extract from a letter recently written by a distinguished Greek Uniate Prelate:

The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem finds itself in a different position financially, they say. The Patriarch of Jerusalem tries to profit by the hopes of American Protestants for reunion with the Orthodox Church, in order to obtain money from them. No doubt this Patriarch does not get any longer what he was used to get from the Russian pilgrims; it would be

very wrong, however, to say that the Greek monks of the Holy Sepulcher are poor. Some of them are millionaires, while the monastery, that is, the Patriarchate, has so many estates and treasures. Their abandoned library in Constantinople contains very valuable things, which would alone suffice to support the Patriarchate for a long time.

All these facts, and the conclusions from these facts, are entirely ignored in the appeal of the American committee. Moreover this document, in giving the impression that the Greek Patriarchate is the only body possessing interests and rights in the Holy Places, gives a false impression. Nobody begrudges generous Americans, with ever-open purses, helping the Greek Patriarch out of his financial difficulties. But they ought also to understand that their generosity is not going to bring to any American church any right to the Holy Places. It is out of the power of the Greek Patriarch to "share" these rights with anybody.

Lectures and Lecturers

P. H. CALLAHAN

A SPLENDID article written by Eugene Weare for a recent number of AMERICA regarding attendance of Catholics at lectures, has just come into the course of my reading, and it impresses me very much. It is really a fine example of constructive criticism, and should do a great deal of good in the way of helping us to realize the wish of the Scot that we might see ourselves as others see us.

The subject was of particular interest to me because it recalled some of the findings of the Religious Prejudice Commission in regard to that very thing. It came to the Commission through a survey made in a city of over 500,000 people, almost half Catholics, that in one year along with 230 odd dances and upwards of 500 card parties, there had been one lecture given under Catholic auspices, according to the published article in their diocesan weekly paper.

As a result of that examination of Catholic activities, the Commission decided to make a careful survey of the Knights of Columbus Council activities in the United States, and a questionnaire was sent to the Councils throughout the country, seeking, among other matters, to elicit information in respect to their lecture programs. Among the questions asked were the following: How often do you have a lecturer's session at meetings? Does program consist of address, paper, or general discussion? Do you have lecturers who are not members to address you? Have you done anything toward training members in speaking? Do you have illustrated lectures on travel or on educational subjects? Have you had any lectures on the following subjects: peace, patriotism, popular government, temperance, industrial relations, the living wage, civic morality, recreation and public playgrounds, the boy question?

The responses to these questions from the 1,800 Councils of the Order in the United States were not so disheartening as that parish survey; but to the extent that they may be said to represent Catholic activities at that time, 1915, they would justify even more severe strictures than Mr. Weare makes regarding the indifference of our people toward the opportunity for intellectual improvement which a well-balanced lecture-program affords. It should, however, be noted, that the data gathered by the Religious Prejudice Commission was confined strictly to K. of C. Councils, and while this would indicate something of the disposition of Catholics toward lectures under non-Catholic auspices, and, perhaps, give room for Mr. Weare's statement that Catholics

do attend lectures, though not generally, those held under Catholic auspices. . . . Our better type of Catholics patronize lectures under Protestant or non-sectarian auspices when they will not venture near a lecture given under Catholic supervision.

But, at the best, this is an undesirable state of affairs. While the present writer would be the very last person to discourage Catholics from attending lectures under non-sectarian auspices, and on the contrary urge that their attendance at such lectures should be increased more and more on every proper occasion, it is nevertheless deplorable that in our own gatherings we neglect this great fertile field of culture, where, in so short a time, so much of enlightenment, so much of the better things of life are made available. The writer in *AMERICA* well says:

A lecture is the nearest thing to the royal road of learning that I know of. Matter that may be delivered in half an hour necessitates, at times, days and even weeks of study, investigation and preparation. The student at such lectures benefits by all this and is saved much hard work and effort. This feature should be pointed out and emphasized, along with others which are readily discoverable.

Two main reasons, separate but related, are offered by Mr. Weare in explanation of the conditions which he describes. They are on the one hand, that most of our Catholic boys and girls are poor and live under the handicaps which that condition naturally imposes in a rich and prosperous country; and on the other hand, those who are fortunate enough to be college graduates have somehow got the impression that Catholic lecturers appearing at Catholic clubs and societies are of an inferior grade and not to be taken seriously. It is noteworthy, too, he says, that as a general thing Catholic college graduates rarely become active in purely parish or diocesan matters, and while admitting that they often do not receive any great encouragement in this direction, he is frank to say that their attitude of unwillingness to engage in lectures and to patronize them calls for censure.

The conclusion from all this is that the rank and file of our people are in danger of being outstripped, and we owe it to ourselves to devote more thought toward cultivating in the rising generation the study and appreciation of better things than cards, pool, the dance and jazz. We but

gain the reputation of being empty boasters when we talk in fine terms about the Church being the patron of all the arts, if at the same time the rank and file of our people appear wholly indifferent to art of any kind in their recreation and pleasure.

There is no doubt that we have the remedy in our hands, if we had only the devotion. But this is needed. It requires intelligent, systematic, patient and persevering effort to work improvement in this field, and, moreover, the most earnest cooperation from the clergy is also required. Even so, the task will seem for a long time to be a thankless task; for, as Mr. Weare says:

the pool playing in the room upstairs will continue; there are those among us who will patronize the Greek bootblackening wrestler or the gentry mauling one another with heavily padded gloves.

But the effort is worth while, and by keeping at it, with appeals from the altar, with personal invitation, with telephone solicitation, with free discussion, and all the other ways and means which non-Catholics utilize to stimulate interest in their cultural work, there is no doubt that a few years will show distinctive achievement in this field in every community where one or two half a dozen will undertake to cultivate our rich but fallow soil.

New York's Tercentenary

F. J. ZWIERLEIN, D.Sc., M.H.

EVERY now and then the press, in print or in picture, refers to the tercentenary of the colonization of New York State. It commemorates the time when this great commonwealth was an infant colony of the Dutch Republic under the name of New Netherland. The early map and the seal also call it New Belgium, as the Mother Country had been in part the home of the ancient Belgae, whom Caesar called the bravest of all the inhabitants of Roman Gaul.

Trading posts had been established before, but the first colony reached New Netherland in May, 1623, according to the conclusions of the best scholars, although the official celebration is set for 1924. The confusion is due to a misunderstanding of Nicolaes Janszoon van Wassenae's contemporary entry in his semi-annual "Historical Account of all the most Remarkable Events which have happened in Europe," etc., which appeared in twenty-one parts, covering the years 1621-1631.* Under April, 1624, he noted that the West India Company "equipped in the spring a vessel of 130 lasts, called Nieu Nederlandt whereof Cornelis Jacobsz May of Hoorn was skipper, with a company of thirty families, mostly Walloons, to plant a colony there. They sailed in the beginning of March, and directing their course by the Canary Islands steered towards the Wild Coast (Dutch Guiana), and gained the west wind which luckily took them, in the beginning of May, into the river called, first, Rio de Montagnes, now the River Mauritius, lying in the forty and one-half degrees." This is our Hudson River. Evidently

the month of May, about which the chronicler is writing under the date of April, 1624, is to be placed in the previous year.

The Walloons were French-speaking Belgians, whose home was then the more southern portion of the Spanish Netherlands that constitute Belgium today. Spanish rule had also extended over the Dutch provinces. Under Philip II (1556-1598), the seventeen Netherland Provinces had united in revolt against Spain to maintain their rights and privileges and to prevent the rumored introduction of the Spanish Inquisition. However, Protestant intrigue and atrocities forced the Catholic Provinces of the South to separate, in self-defense, from the Northern Provinces. With the redress of grievances, the Catholic South returned to the Spanish allegiance and so helped Spanish arms to reconquer some of the disaffected cities, which persecuting Protestantism had come to control. The Northern Provinces under Protestant domination, with foreign help, first from Catholic France, and then from Protestant England, formed the Dutch Republic.

In these Protestant Netherlands the Reformed Church of strict Calvinistic Presbyterianism became the established religion of the State, to the exclusion of the private and public worship of all other Christian denominations and even to the forcible repression of a more moderate Calvinism. Economic reasons largely account for a limited toleration of Judaism and for the partial non-enforcement of some of the repressive measures against Catholics, who still formed the majority even in Holland. Nevertheless, Catholics had no equal rights before the law, could hold no public office. They were personally unmolested in their religious convictions, but the common, public exercise of worship was not granted them, no Mass, no Confirmation, no participation in pilgrimages. Their sons could not study at foreign Catholic universities. Their marriages had to be contracted before the Schout and Schepens (civil officials), and in the Common Lands, for a time, even before the Reformed Preachers. Their children were even forced, here and there, to attend the Reformed School; and their priests were punished with banishment and confiscation of their goods as soon as they appeared in public. (Knappert).

These circumstances make it evident that the Walloon colonists had joined the political and religious enemies of their homeland, who glorified in the name of Water-beggars, as they had been named by their opponents. They did not, however, join the Huguenots, as the French Protestants had become known. There were, however, some Huguenots amongst the first colonists. It seems strange that these are the ones, and not primarily the Walloons, that are honored by the coinage of Huguenot "half dollars" to commemorate the tercentenary of the colony, although, it is true, the inscription on the obverse side of the coin shows it was struck in commemoration of the joint anniversary of the Huguenot-Walloon founding of New Netherland. It is still stranger that the nation, to which the colony belonged, is entirely ignored.

When the first of these coins was presented to President Coolidge in the company of Ambassador Jusserand of France and Ambassador Baron de Cartier de March-

ienne of Belgium, the newspaper picture shows the President smiling as if it were a joke, and he is right, at least partly. He may have caught a bit of Washington Irving's Knickerbocker spirit and seen the funny side of the situation. The Frenchman and the Belgian have crowded out the poor Dutchman, unless he is represented by Rev. Dr. Charles S. Macfarland, the President of the Tercentenary Commission, who is also in the picture. The newspaper dispatches tell us, in fact, of a Huguenot-Walloon New Netherland Commission, Inc., instituted by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, which apparently arranged this coin as a memorial feature of the celebration.

There is another funny side to this. The Kukluxers flooded the Treasury Department with protests when they wrongly suspected that there was a dollar bill marked with some "Papist emblems." Now here we have a Protestant fifty-cent piece; for Huguenot and French Protestant are synonyms. Nevertheless, we Catholics will not object, provided we get enough of these fifty-cent pieces to pay our bills and to swell our bank accounts.

There was, it is true, a strong bond to connect the Protestant Walloon and the Huguenot as well as the Dutch Water-beggar, namely a common Father in religion, John Calvin, whose great book, the "Institutes of the Christian Religion," is the key to the understanding of persecuting Reformed Protestantism, wherever it became dominant after defection from the Catholic Church. For Calvin first labored to make out cases of blasphemy, of sacrilege, and of idolatry, against Catholic theology and Catholic worship. Then he demanded that a Christian government have the Decalogue as a constitutional base for its laws, teaching that it "is contained in two heads, of which one simply commands the worship of God in pure faith and piety, the other the embracing of men in pure love."

The best commentary on this writes:

For government looks not only to this, that men breathe, eat, drink and be cared for (although it certainly embraces all these things while making it possible for men to live together), I say it does not only look to this, but lest there arise and be spread amongst the people idolatries, sacrileges against the name of God, blasphemies against His truth, and other public offenses of religion, lest the public peace be disturbed, but that each one have safe and firm possession of his property, that men conduct harmless business amongst themselves, that finally a public form of religion be established amongst Christians, that humanity obtain amongst men.

Things are jumbled together here without much logical order. Nevertheless, it is evident that, according to Calvin, the State is not only to enforce the Second, but also the First Table of the Law of God, and *that* according to what he considers pure faith and piety, his reformed religion. For, in referring "to human government the right establishment of religion," he carefully notes:

I permit men to make laws on religion and the worship of God, when I approve a government settlement of religion that labors for this, that the true religion, which is contained in God's

Law, be not violated and defiled openly and by public sacrileges with impunity.

The enforcement of Calvinism, therefore, meant the death-knell to Catholicism, or to any other dissenting religion that a Calvinistic State presumed to consider blasphemous, sacrilegious, or idolatrous.

As these principles ruled, as much as possible, the

Province of New Netherland while under Dutch control (1623-1664), it explains how the writer's doctoral dissertation for Louvain University, "*Religion in New Netherland*," practically developed into a history of New Netherland intolerance in the repression of dissenters in the colony, particularly of the Lutheran, the Quaker, and the Jew.

Which Is the Better Woman?

ELBRIDGE COLBY

RECENTLY in *Current History Magazine* appeared an article on "The Changing Morality of Woman" by Miss Alyse Gregory, which merits the serious consideration of all persons who care for themselves or the State. After reviewing what she seemed to regard as the subjugation of woman in past ages and her gradually increasing participation in world affairs, she discusses the old, old attacks on the so called "double standard" in which a popular attempt was made some years since to bring men to the same views and conduct in personality, which the world demands of women. Then, according to Miss Gregory, came the war to demonstrate the general rottenness of men as far as sex is concerned and the general adaptabilities of women as far as economic independence and commercial value is concerned. Thus, Miss Gregory would have us believe, the life of woman is today something like this:

Ministers may extol chastity for women from pulpit rostrums and quote passages from the New and Old Testaments to prove that purity and fidelity are still her most precious assets, but this new woman only shrugs her shoulders and smiles a slow, penetrating secret smile. This is not to imply that over vast stretches of the United States, and certainly in the small towns and villages, young girls and women in bourgeois homes are not living lives of impeccable chastity, but in the great cities in those circles where women from twenty-five to thirty-five can control their own purse strings many of them are apt to drift into casual or steady relationships with certain men friends which may or may not end in matrimony. Undoubtedly in time these men and women will rediscover that monogamy has, after all, its many advantages, but it is unlikely that the Western World will ever again ask of woman that strictness in behavior which it has never demanded of men.

It is to be noted that Miss Gregory confines her remarks to the women who belong to what may be called the middle class. In a sweeping indictment she has already said that "women of the aristocratic upper classes and the poorest women . . . never followed too rigidly the cast-iron rules of respectability." Even in the middle class—which with the phraseology of the liberal young intellectualists she calls "bourgeois"—she admits a measure of propriety and thinks that the situation she describes exists chiefly among the working girls "whose employers ask no questions as to her life outside of the office" and to whose "snug and pleasant rooms, she and she alone, unless perhaps one other, carries the key."

Suppose we admit with her that "there is no use pretending that such a state of affairs does not exist." Of course it exists. It probably has existed since the beginning of the modern world. The Mosaic commandment against evil of this sort would never have been promulgated unless there had been occasion for it. It is a tendency that has continued with more or less flagrancy for centuries. It is indeed a tendency that has marked the decline in virility, the decline in birth-rate, the decline in prestige and strength of nations. To write a long article about the modern manifestation of this age-old evil and to call it typical of present tendencies rather reminds the reader of the principle enunciated some time past about "new thinkers" simply being people who have not taken the trouble to inform themselves of what other people have already thought. When a writer like this describes "the changing morality of woman" in terms like these one is tempted to feel that she is speaking not of woman as a whole but of a few women who have happened to come under her observation, and to recall the words of Anatole France, who remarked that "every creature, however small, is at the center of the world." Frankly, it does appear that Miss Gregory exaggerates. At any rate it would be very discouraging to have to believe that the modern campaign for morality which started by demanding of men the same high standards as of women, had failed utterly and that the "double standard" had been abolished by the degradation of woman instead of by the elevation of man.

The practical danger of the encouragement of such a course lies in Miss Gregory's seeming promise that the new woman is perhaps "in the end of greater use to the community." In the home the future of the nation is made or marred, and anything that endangers the home endangers modern society. With divorces running at the rate of one to seven, one to nine, and one to twelve marriages, with infidelity universally recognized as the direct or indirect cause of most divorces, with a young woman flapper writing in the *New York Times* that she much prefers married men for her "affairs" and that all her flapper friends do likewise—with such a situation it is a bad time to praise the so called new morality of women. To be sure our authoress grants that these people may rediscover the "many advantages" of

monogamy. But her entire point of view is unnatural and undesirable and distorted. From the beginning she starts out to plead for a liberalization of woman's position, saying nothing that has not been said many times before. Then she records quite properly the moral looseness that characterized the war years. Yet when she calls the few alterations she has observed as "one of the most extraordinary and disturbing changes in the status of woman that has so far taken place throughout the recorded history of man" the evidence of our own eyes contradicts us. I am not speaking of Rosary Societies, or Christian Endeavor Unions, or of the better and more religious types of men and women. I am speaking of the type of woman with whom I come in contact in work. I have handed Miss Gregory's paper to stenographers, and private secretaries, and executives; and I have found them unanimous in condemning it. And even if their condemnation is insincere, it is condemnation none the less, for one of the lady's points is the new world takes this more for granted and considers such conduct with less shame than before.

There are independent women in the big cities making their own way in the world of business, but their inclinations are not those she would have us believe. They may play around a bit, and sometimes be indiscreet, and trade their fascinations without sin for the substantial entertainment of men. Some I have known, say they do not care to go around with younger men, because the younger men are not in a position to be so liberal with dinner invitations and theater tickets as the older men, just as all know that there are women who will marry purely for money and without love or the thought of love. But all that is their loss; they choose the thing which seems more attractive and must forego the other.

And of course when you get down to it, one may possibly say that the entire question of morality is a matter of personal preferences after all. Those who hold fast to the eternal verities, based upon sound revelation, developed through centuries of experience, and frequently found valid and useful to the world at large—those will consult their spiritual advisers and will learn how to avoid the occasions of sin and the proximate causes and circumstances whence sin may spring. Those who are determined to transgress, have already sinned in thought and word, and the completion of the deed can scarcely be prevented except by force. But it is in the last analysis not a question of purely personal preferences. Murder is punished because it is a crime against society. Burglary is punished because it is detrimental to social happiness. The manufacture, sale, and transportation of intoxicants are now punished because they are deemed bad for the welfare of the nation. One man's business has become everybody's business, and everybody sees that appropriate legislation is enacted to secure the betterment of social conditions. Personal desires and preferences, personal liberties and individual pleasures have now little or no

weight in the balance. We may dislike the prohibition law, yet we are obligated as loyal citizens to obey it. We may dislike the Mann Act, yet we are obligated to obey it. And if this tendency and inclination described by Miss Gregory was near so widespread as she seems to believe and were as inimical to the future welfare of society as it would be if it were so widespread, the time will come when sociologists and reformers will eventually join with the ecclesiastical forces and see that the new morality is plainly stamped as immoral and definitely repressed.

If it is against the law to go across the river to New Jersey, and there offend against one of the fundamental commandments, why should it not also be just as plainly against the law to transgress in the same way even though the guilty parties do not go out of the State, but instead of merely taking the ferry a mile or so to Hoboken take a train four hundred odd miles to Buffalo. The Church has always fought the evils of the flesh. The Church has never recognized the "double standard" and would be far from acquiescing in any reduced standard of morality. We Catholics more than any other people must feel that Miss Gregory's estimate of the situation is exaggerated. We Catholics with practical experience in an effective and universal religion know that there is one way of combating the danger which we feel Miss Gregory points out to us. We know that we can urge the sanctity of the Sacrament of matrimony where others are left to fall back upon the mere argumentative presentation of what Miss Gregory calls "the many advantages of monogamy." Yet even though the statement may be exaggerated, we must admit there is a slight element of truth in it, a very slight increase in immorality of this sort since the year 1914, we will say. Noting this increase, we must take up the fight as strongly as possible. Convinced of the propriety and the truth and the practical value of our position, we may feel that the disadvantages of the mode of life depicted by Miss Gregory will eventually become apparent and will be discarded. But in the intervals there would be many heartburnings and many regrets, and many mistakes, and many a fault that might otherwise be avoided. In order to save as much as possible of this unnecessary anguish, it is well to get to work, for what sensible and loving father would prefer to let his child burn his fingers on the hot stove so severely as to do him harm simply because learning by experience is supposed to be so effective. Those who play with pitch may get scorched in the fire, and it is believed that an energetic effort to prevent their playing with pitch would benefit the individuals concerned and save social harm. It is for us who hold to these things more faithfully, more securely, and more concretely than others who are not of our Church, to take the lead and make plain our program and enforce its application to the utmost of our ability and energy, both for the saving of plainly stamped as immoral and definitely repressed as illegal.

COMMUNICATIONS

The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department

Relation of Alcohol to Crime

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The "First Annual Report of the Maryland State Board of Welfare, 1923," contains some very interesting information. On examining the various "Exhibits" we discover that on September 30, 1923, there were 933 male prisoners in the Maryland Penitentiary. Of these 804 were first offenders, and 129 were "repeaters," that is, such as had served time for other offenses. More than half of the prison population, namely 486, were *total abstainers*, and only 29 were excessive drinkers. This last item ought to be sad news to the prohibitionists, who insistently assert that alcohol is the most prolific cause of crime in the world.

There is one other item that ought to give another class of "reformers" in the State food for thought. We have heard it said, right here in Maryland, by a certain agitator, that "dope" addicts crowd our Penitentiary, and that it is very easy to traffic in "dope" there. Well, on September 30, 1923, of 933 prisoners, only two were drug addicts. This is truly astounding when we consider that the so-called "underworld" is supposed to be honey-combed with caches for "dope." And, be it said in passing, no one is easier to discover than a drug addict. Any experienced physician or social worker can, after a few minutes conversation and observation, detect an addict.

As I have asserted on previous occasions, the addict is a sick person, or an abnormal person, and should be handled and treated by our physicians and not by our lawmakers. With Dr. Hollander, Dr. Edward H. Williams and Dr. Bishop we may say that normal persons very rarely have recourse to dope and very rarely become addicts. Let, then, the Harrison Law take care of the peddlers and the unscrupulous physicians who specialize in dope-prescriptions, but let our addicts, whose number has been grossly exaggerated, receive proper treatment at home or in our hospitals, without being hounded to death by Federal and State drug-snoopers.

Baltimore.

JOSEPH J. AYD, S.J.

Catholic Women's League Hostel in Bethlehem

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I see a letter from Miss Reed-Lewis in the issue of AMERICA for February 9 on the "Catholic Women's League Hostel in Bethlehem" and I want to ask you if you will follow it up by something with more "ginger" in it. During the war Miss Reed-Lewis was the moving spirit at the Soldiers' Club, run by the Catholic Women's League at Bexhill and financed by the Catholic Army Huts and Knights of Columbus of Canada. After the war she became cataloguer at the Bexhill Library, and stuck to this work after the Library was transferred to the Catholic Truth Society in London. In June, 1923, accompanying her parents to Spain, she was appointed head of the C. W. L. Settlement in Bethlehem and went there in September. Experienced and typically American in energy and resourcefulness she has thrown herself into the work as a labor of love.

That the headship of such an enterprise should be entrusted to an American, the education department to an Irish lady, and the weaving to an Englishwoman shows the very Catholic lines upon which the work has been inaugurated.

The struggle consists in coping with Protestant American dollars, which are being poured into the Holy Land. A recent publication, "A Palestine Note Book," by C. R. Ashbee, late Civic Advisor to the City of Jerusalem, a British official of Hebrew origin, gives abundant evidence of this. "From America," he says, "we must get our support and this money for Jerusalem (p. 66). Jerusalem must be visualized also from the angle of Canterbury" (p. 69). "We talked of Crete and Egypt, of how people should dig, and of

the blessed word Mesopotamia, of the future British 'politik,' of international antiquarianism, and, rather timidly, of our rich American cousins" (p. 72). Referring to the Y. M. C. A. he writes: "A larger percentage of his 'Christian Young Men,' Harter tells me, are Jews" (p. 166). Surely if Protestant money is so assured, Catholics should give as generous a support to their work of establishing in the Faith Arab Christians, whom this Young Men's Hebro-Christian Association would convert.

Dinard, France.

WM. REED-LEWIS.

Drives for Funds and Drives for Vocations

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Being engaged in Catholic educational work for life, it was with profound interest and much pleasure that I read of the \$3,000,000 drive proposed by Bishop Boyle for the advancement of Catholic education in the polyglot diocese of Pittsburgh. The means proposed for the drive are very apposite and cannot but prove most effectual. They will, no doubt, win all the success aimed at.

But how about the teachers necessary for the additional schools to be built? Will they be forthcoming just as the educational structures rise? This is to be devoutly hoped for, but facts seem to speak contrarywise, unless some systematic and persistent effort be made to enlist more of our exemplary Catholic boys and girls in the ranks of the religious teaching orders. Without our religious teachers what proportion of our Catholic schools could keep afloat?

An idea came to my mind in this connection. Were it not advisable, together with such financial drives, or, apart from them, to inaugurate in parishes, and even in whole dioceses, drives for religious teachers' vocations? Almost every Religious Order is also an educational society.

For nineteen years I have been teaching in parish grade and high schools and cannot recall having heard during all that time one sermon, or part of a sermon, referring to the excellence of the religious teachers' vocation or calling for candidates to the Orders. I doubt not but the clergy of the splendid parishes I was engaged in were the peers of any in the land and they loved their religious teachers. To what may this apparent neglect be attributed? Perhaps to forgetfulness of necessities that others were supposed to look after?

Two excellent priests I became acquainted with encouraged vocations during their visits to the classrooms. In one diocese, the vicar-general, a most zealous and exemplary clergyman, would tell the boys distinctly that he believed some of them were called to the holy and meritorious life of their religious teachers. As argument he would say: "How can we expect other parishes always to furnish us with religious teachers, if our parish does not reciprocate and furnish some to them?"

But the vocation to the life of a religious educator, a life so humble and self-sacrificing, cannot be called forth by a mere word to a supposed ready hearer. The seed of the vocation must be planted in fertile soil. Children must be prepared to receive it and parents to foster it. Pampered children that were seldom taught to restrain themselves for a holy cause will not readily be fascinated by the picture of a self-denying life. Parents who never put any but worldly ambition into the hearts of their offspring are not liable to encourage a religious vocation in them.

Many pious parents would consider it a privilege to have a child of theirs specially devoted to God's holy service and to saving the souls of others, thus cooperating with the Saviour of mankind. If so, the parents must keep their children innocent, fill their souls with holy strivings for God's cause, lead them to practises of zeal and piety; then, when a call to a higher life is made upon such children, they are liable to be responsive to it. Not otherwise. No one can guide parents better in this preparation than their parish priests, the religious teachers themselves having scarce any opportunity to address them. This way, in my humble

opinion, a number of priests, working along these lines, would assist each other in securing religious teachers for their respective schools. God grant it to be thus.

Dayton.

A. A. W.

[Reference to a "Crusade for Vocations," inaugurated by the Catholic Hospital Association, is made in our Note and Comment section of this issue.—Ed. AMERICA.]

Historic Graves

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mr. George F. O'Dwyer, of Lowell, raises several interesting points in his letter, "Graves of Catholic Soldiers of the Revolution," in AMERICA for March 1, 1924. The question of the burial places of the Catholic Revolutionary soldiers is important. Unfortunately, public interest in such matters has long been dormant. That there is a growing interest, which though weak is nonetheless in existence, is, however, a hopeful sign.

Nothing could be more pleasing than to feel that in our own historic grave-yards we have remains of our own Revolutionary soldiers. The proof, however, has not yet been brought forth. The Catholic soldiers who were residents of Boston and who fell in the Revolutionary battles were of necessity buried in the same cemeteries as the non-Catholics, for there were no Catholic cemeteries anywhere near Boston in 1776, nor for many years after. In fact, when Father Matignon died, his body was first laid in the Granary Burying Ground, I think it was, until Bishop Cheverus was able to secure the location on Dorchester Heights to which Mr. O'Dwyer referred. Father Matignon died September 18, 1818. Bishop Cheverus' title to land at Dorchester and Sixth streets, South Boston, was recorded on December 11, 1818, according to the Suffolk County Registry of Deeds. This was thirty-seven years after the Surrender at Yorktown. Probably there were many men who fought in the Revolutionary War who were still living at that time and a proportionate number of them doubtless were Catholics. But remembering the size of the Catholic congregation in Boston during that period, 1776-1819, it would be indeed remarkable if we were able to show any interments of veterans in our cemeteries unless by translation to a family burial lot acquired later.

Whether or not these old grave-yards contain the remains of veterans of the early wars does not detract, however, from their intrinsic worth in the least. The Catholic Church in Boston is particularly fortunate in the location of its pioneer cemeteries. The one purchased by Bishop Cheverus in South Boston is on historic Dorchester Heights; that purchased by Bishop Fenwick in Charlestown, ten years later, is on the top of Bunker Hill, on part of the battle-ground. Indeed, because of the sentiment of the people of Charlestown for the battle-grounds, Bishop Fenwick was to the end of his life troubled by various efforts to restrict his use of the land as a place of sepulture for his people. The interesting history of the Charlestown Burying Ground has occupied my personal attention for some years now and the facts will be arranged in proper form in time, I hope, for the one hundredth anniversary of acquisition, in 1930.

The practical value of all this interest in by-gones should be a spirit of respect and reverence inculcated in the present generation. The consecration of ground as a place for burial does mean something. Probably there is nothing more repugnant to the Catholic sense than to know of the burial of a baptized person in unconsecrated ground. There is no doctrine of the Church more frequently referred to than that of remembrance of the dead. It was early insisted upon by Bishop Carroll, occurring in his first Pastoral in 1792 (see "National Catholic Pastorals of the American Hierarchy," edited by the Rev. Peter Guilday, Ph.D., Washington, 1923, p. 12). The subject of respect for consecrated ground is clearly provided for in the new Code of Canon Law. I quote from among many pertinent canons in "The New Canon Law," by the Rev. Stanislaus Woywood, O.F.M., Wagner, N. Y.,

1918: "1050—The laws of the Canons concerning the interdict, violation, and reconciliation of churches are to be applied also to cemeteries."

Cannot we then do each a little to add to the peace and loveliness of these holy places at the same time that we draw from them a little of their charm and ruggedness, for beautiful they are, if given just a little care, even though not as consciously pretty as many of those of our non-Catholic neighbors.

Boston.

MIRIAM T. MURPHY

Shakespeare the Thinker

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I read with interest the article on "Getting Acquainted With Shakespeare," by Benedict Fitzpatrick, in the issue of AMERICA for January 12, but found some assertions made therein rather astounding.

Mr. Fitzpatrick states Shakespeare is not a thinker and that he has merely a remarkable talent for writing. Will Mr. Fitzpatrick define what constitutes a thinker? Surely a thinker is one who thinks, and if that is so, to be the author of a play, if only a poor one, qualifies that author as a thinker. What a writer of marvelous plays Shakespeare is! He chose to dramatize plays that appeal to the rich and the poor, the educated and the ignorant of all Christian nations. None but a thinker could do that. A window-dresser never could do so. Why, there is all and everything in Shakespeare's plays: humor and pathos, comedy and tragedy, commonplace and magnificent, action and ease, luxury and penury, the thoughts of the costermonger, the ideals of the prince, the achievements of the hero, the machinations of the villain, all appear and reappear in so realistic a way as to strike and charm the imagination. Only a thinker could do this. Take the lines addressed by Cardinal Wolsey to Thomas Cromwell: "Had I but served my God with half the zeal I served my king, he would not in mine age have left me naked to mine enemies." These words were taken by Shakespeare from the manuscript of the life of Cardinal Wolsey, written by his gentleman servant Cavendish. Shakespeare saw their beauty and dramatic value, and with an author's privilege has Wolsey address them to Thomas Cromwell. Shakespeare shows himself a thinker when he delves into forbidden and secreted manuscripts, as this was at the time, and seizes on what is beautiful and dramatic and fits it in to suit the circumstances of the play.

Again note Shakespeare's wonderful character creations, to mention but a few: the Jew in "The Merchant of Venice," Iago in "Othello," Lear in "King Lear," Falstaff in "Henry the Fourth," Richard the Second in the play of that name. What a thinker to create such characters! Surely, surely someone has rushed in where angels fear to tread.

Shakespeare is a king of thinkers. All men of sound mind think, but few are they who can express their thoughts as Shakespeare could express his own, and they are such that still his audience grows, and will, I firmly believe, continue to grow as long as mankind exists on earth. Further on in his article, Mr. Fitzpatrick says: "He never gets far away from the understanding of the pit and the gallery," and again a little further on: "He merely gives the common man his own thought, gracefully defined and clothed in princely raiment." How does Mr. Fitzpatrick gage the understanding of the pit and gallery of a Shakespearean play? What is his definition of a common man?

To judge of the audiences of Shakespearean plays in this city in our day, professors, teachers and students largely predominate, and I have no doubt the others present possess that excellent understanding which draws them to view Shakespearean plays.

Does Mr. Fitzpatrick's common man belong to the poet class of which he speaks in the next breath? Or is he all mankind? For Shakespeare appeals to commoner and king, to student and professor, to learned and ignorant. The greatest actors delight to interpret his character parts.

Montreal.

W. H. WICKHAM.

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1924

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUBBLEIN;
Treasurer, GERALD C. TREACY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Address:

Suite 4847, Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Murray Hill 1635

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Public Office and Private Gain

WHERE the investigations now conducted by the Senate will end, no man may say, but good will probably emerge from the present turmoil. The United States conducts what, from one point of view, may be regarded as a large business. It must perforce trust a multitude of employes, of whom all are human, some incapable and a few dishonest. It is time to overhaul the stock, to call the force to the office to give an accounting.

Not the least valuable of the proposed "leads" suggested to the Senate, is that which proposes to discover what former members of Congress, cabinet officers, and Government employes of lower grade, have been engaged in cases before the Departments of War, the Navy, the Treasury and the Interior. It is not denied that two or three former members of the Cabinet were employed on leaving office as "advisors" or as legal counsel to large corporations having business relations with the Government. One, as now seems evident, was retained as counsel for a private corporation in a case which began very shortly after he left the Cabinet. The statute governing such employment is not clear, and a debate in the Senate did not help much to clarify its prohibitions. While the statute forbids under-officials to engage in cases which were under litigation or in course of progress at the time they were in the Government's service, it does not seem certain that this prohibition extends to the heads of Departments.

Leaving aside the legal, ethical and moral aspects of the question, it is plain that employment of this kind is absolutely repugnant to the good sense and good faith of our people. To play both sides of the game, first as an official for the Government and then as a private citizen against the Government is, in their view, so close to dis-

honor that it should forever bar from further office-holding. The use of knowledge, gained as an official, for personal profit after the office has been relinquished, involves delicate points in ethics and morality. But it is certain that this knowledge may not be used if it is equivalent to a breach of faith, if it damages the Government, or any private citizen, or if it can rightly be construed as contrary to public policy and the common good. It is a matter of common knowledge that the corruption of our great municipalities arises in large measure from the practise of capitalizing official knowledge for private profit. Human nature is the same in a cross-roads village and at Washington, and the only difference in the result is that corruption is greater when the same cause operates at the capital.

Legislation forbidding Government employes of every grade to engage in claims, cases and controversies, in which the Government is a party, for a period of five years after relinquishment of office, is now proposed. Some such regulation appears to be necessary. If honor cannot put a stop to this failure to recognize that public office is for all time a public trust, and not primarily a means of heaping up wealth, let us have a law which will force our ex-statesmen to make their choice between disinterestedness and venality, between greed and the penitentiary.

Are We Learning?

FROM the beginning there have been public officials who regarded their commissions merely as a chance to make money easily. For the wrong type of man there is a lure in public employment that is almost irresistible. To be counted on the payroll of the State is much like receiving something for nothing. But a few months of experience bring disillusionment, and then begins temptation. A public official learns much of human weakness. Every man seems to have his price, and many are willing to pay it. He learns of "opportunities" in politics and business, some dishonest, some dubious. Then the stage is set for disaster; not public, always, for he may be cunning enough to keep his operations hidden, but moral disaster.

It has been suggested that one way of attracting the better class of citizen to public office is to pay public officials higher salaries. Men whose professional incomes, won by intelligence, honesty and toil, may reach \$20,000, are not likely to enter the public service for incomes one-half or one-fourth that sum. Upright and able men in public office are usually underpaid. Again and again have men left Washington, where they had been engaged in research work, to serve with private corporations at a salary from ten to twenty times greater than they had received from the Government. One reason, it is said, why the work of Washington bureaus and departments is so slow, and, often, so inaccurate, is that "business and the corporations" are continually taking the high-grade workers away from the Government. Long ago the city and county of New York learned that it was wisdom to

establish the highest-paid judiciary in the United States. It was the only way to attract the type of professional man which the bench needed. Today the citizen in moderate circumstances, no matter what his ambition or his real ability, often is debarred from office by the fact that it cannot give him and his family a decent living. No doubt there are able and upright citizens among the rich, but the rich form a very small minority. If the field is restricted to them, the number of eligible officials will indeed be small.

The Real Remedy

YET it would be absurd to conclude that higher salaries will solve the problem. The real difficulty lies far deeper. The times demand an awakening of spirit and a searching of consciences. This is a materialistic age, an age of increasing wealth, an age in which the old restraints imposed by religion are passing away. What is to take their place? Or, rather, what *can* take their place?

Napoleon was no devotee, but he had the clear sense to realize that there would never be peace and good order in the State, unless the people were not only permitted but encouraged to practise their religion. A cynic himself, caring little for religion or even common morality when either struck across the path of his ambitions, he feigned a virtue when he had it not, and posed as the protector of religion. Men of infinitely higher views, real statesmen such as Washington, Mason, Hamilton and Madison, assessed the value of religion to the State more earnestly, more intelligently. In his "Farewell Address," a document which embodies the political creed of all these early Americans, Washington announced, as a principle of political wisdom, that the preservation of the American form of government in its integrity depended upon the obedience of the people to the dictates of religion and morality. Nor had he any patience with the theory that morality could be built upon any foundation but that of religion.

Here, then, is the remedy for the scandalous conditions in public life which are shocking our people—the promotion of religion and morality among all classes. But, as a people, what means are we using toward this desired end? Seventy years ago, under the delusion that we were slaying the chimera of political union between Church and State, we concluded that public schools in which the child might be taught the principles of religion and morality were incompatible with our political philosophy. Undoubtedly, religious education, then as now, was a problem, but we did not solve it in a rational manner by divorcing the public school from religion. Is there no connection between the fact that today six out of every ten Americans profess no religion whatever, and the other fact that of every ten Americans probably nine were trained in schools from which instruction in religion is forbidden? If the child whose world is the school, finds no religion in that early environment, it is highly improbable that he will greatly care to reserve a place for religion in the en-

vironment of his later years. At least, he has not done so.

We have, then, a present generation which, if religious affiliation can be taken as an indication, sets no high value on religion and morality. But according to Washington, good government depends upon religion and morality among the people. What wonder, then, that Congress and some of our State legislatures have resolved themselves into investigating committees? Or that, in the words of former Senator Beveridge, "corruption riots in officialdom"?

The first and most necessary move toward reform is a deeper and more consistent interest in the religious formation of the child. He is the citizen of tomorrow. Investigators may be able to uncover official dishonesty, even to punish it. But what can they do to prevent its recurrence? Unless we begin with the child, giving him a training which will result in an enlightened intelligence and a will determined to embrace what is good and avoid what is evil, all the forces of government will be powerless to check the spread of public and private corruption.

Books and Reading

NO accurate statistics have ever been made concerning the number of serious books read by the average person during a lifetime. Professor Robert M. Lovett, as quoted in an article in the *Extension Magazine*, hazards the statement that the average person reads only sixteen books, and the author of the article, advancing a step further, declares: "I believe that it would be gross exaggeration to say that the average (English speaking) Catholic reads sixteen books during his or her lifetime." The "average person" is a myth, and general statements like this one are difficult to prove. Evidence more tangible, however, in testimony to the statement that serious books and Catholic books are not popular reading is furnished by the results of the poll conducted among the students of Notre Dame University. The question proposed was, "How many Catholic books have you read in college?" The high point was reached by fourteen students who had read more than twenty Catholic books; but these were more than counterbalanced by the 199 students who confessed that they had read none. If the same question were put to the educated Catholics of the country, results would show that the proportion of those who had read no Catholic books would be deplorably increased.

The reading of serious books and of Catholic books by our Catholic people is a matter which deserves consideration. In many parishes, literary societies are in existence; but their literary activities are exhausted in compiling the scores of their pool tournaments and their basketball averages. Many parishes, too, have libraries, as populous as the "Deserted Village." Libraries, even in many colleges, are too often sorry spectacles. Innocent Catholic books, which have not been guilty of any offense, are guarded by lock and cage as securely as the veriest murderer in the death house. A few years ago the discovery was made that the public libraries, most of them, carried very few

Catholic books. There was hectic excitement; charges of bigotry and of discrimination against Catholic literature were made; the public libraries began to acquire Catholic books. But the sequel has not shown that these books are in any great demand; few of them have required re-binding; most of them are as unspotted as they were when first they left the printer's hand.

An analysis of the monthly score of the most popular non-fiction books, published by the *Bookman*, furnishes indirect confirmation to the thesis that Catholics show little interest in the "heavies" of literature. Papini's "Life of Christ," read by Catholics and non-Catholics alike, heads the score. Of the remaining nine books listed, four are utterly abhorrent to Catholic teaching. It must be remembered that the *Bookman* list is compiled from the reports furnished by the libraries. Many and varied are the conclusions that may be drawn from the fact that forty per cent of the most popular serious books of the day are antagonistic to Catholic thought. One conclusion, not to be lightly admitted, is that Catholics are reading such books. Another, less scandalous but still deplorable, is that Catholics demand so few Catholic books from the libraries that they have no influence on the determination of the monthly scores.

Mr. Volstead and the Angels

PERHAPS it is unfair to write that in sailing over the troubled sea of prohibition the New York *Times* has steered an erratic course. "Troubled" would be a fitter epithet. It is not easy to defend a law which one believes foolish and therefore unenforceable; but it is only fair to

acknowledge that the *Times* has always ranged itself on the side of the angels, if it be proper to name angels in this connection, when there was question of weakening the force of the Volstead act. Hence it will not be accused of mere carping when it calls upon Prohibition Commissioner Haynes to leave off talking about enforcing the Volstead act and to begin enforcing it.

Mr. Haynes may be doing all that is possible. So did Mrs. Partington when with one unaided broom she strove to beat back the swell of the North Atlantic. Mr. Haynes has written a book to chronicle his victories; like General Butler of Philadelphia, he daily announces the defeat of evil. But evil does not appear to stay defeated, although both gentlemen labor from dewy morn to cooling eve, and General Butler is even reported as roaring through the quiet midnight streets of Philadelphia in his military automobile. A civilian himself, Mr. Haynes commands an armed force. His agents have been murdered by militant bootleggers, but to balance the account a number of bootleggers and one Senator of the United States have been laid low by his agents. The reports read like the official returns after a battle. New York, of course, is as dry as the cerements of old King Tutahnkamen; officially, that is, for the hospital reports and the speeches of the Police Commissioner tell another story.

Mr. Fabian Franklin, who writes occasionally on political topics, takes a gloomy view of the entire case. "It's not a bad law because it can't be enforced," he observes, with reference to Mr. Volstead's masterpiece, "but it can't be enforced because it's bad law." Possibly Mr. Franklin is correct. At least the law is not enforced.

Literature

Imitation and Recognition in Art

"MY favorite author," a practical business man recently declared, "is Charles Dickens. I had no use for him when I was a boy, but since I've been out in the world I've met so many different kinds of people that when I now turn to Dickens I seem to meet persons I actually know." This man's change in taste is a ready example of what is effected by recognition in literature. "Imitation" is the act of the artist when he imitates or faithfully portrays in his work what he has seen in actual life. "Recognition" is the act of the public when it recognizes in a work of art the faithful representation of what it has seen in actual life.

Just at this time a question much discussed in literary and art circles regards the proper status of these factors, imitation and recognition. Are they desirable? Are they necessary? Are they sufficient for truly great art? Undoubtedly imitation is necessary and desirable for truly great art. Lately we see some deviation from this principle in the esthetic bolshevism of the impressionistic verse and cubistic and futuristic paintings. The fault in

these excursions of art lies in this, that the "artists" hold imitation absolutely unnecessary and, in fact, as a prostitution of true art. The very chaos and lack of appeal of their resulting productions is ample evidence against their horrible error.

The impressionistic school is correct in decrying the photographic art of those ultra-realists who attempt to put in writing or painting the exact, detailed representation of actual life. But it is sadly mistaken in swinging with the impetuous pendulum of reaction to the opposite extreme where the acme of art consists of a hash and hodge-podge of words or colors bearing no relation whatsoever to any being, object or idea which man in the most violent nightmare could ever conceive to exist.

An artist must not rely on imitation alone in order to achieve the best results, nor can he totally disregard the factor of imitation. He must use imitation with discretion and judgment. He must ruminate, cerebration, or whatever you will, on a given subject, and must walk round and round the object in mental perambulation. When it is fully digested and assimilated into his imagina-

tion and intellect he must proceed to make a careful selection of details. All the details he does not want; he wants the salient, outstanding details and even these details the artist must not dish out to us in a dry, scientific manner. He must color them with the spectrum of his imagination. If his imagination have no color then he can not claim to be an artist. In an artistic representation of a real object we should have, not a faithful picture of the external, real object, but we should see that object as apprehended and comprehended by the artist. We must see it through his eyes. It must be colored with his thought and emotion, not with our own. The shallow utilitarian who does not realize this truth laughs at the art lover who sees more value in viewing and studying a landscape by Rousseau than in journeying to Barbizon to get a sight of the very fields from which the landscape was painted.

In looking on any beautiful scene, on the moonlit lake, on the lightning-slashed sky, on the broad, flat expanse of prairie, we are directly impressed with certain details and experience the most ardent emotions of quiet beauty, of awe or loneliness as the case may be. However in so viewing the scene we are not viewing the scene as it actually is but as it influences us. We are the artists, therefore, who make the selection of details and color the object with our own subjective emotions. Were we to represent the external object in such a mood, we would be the artists and our representation would be art. Then, when other people gazed upon our creation, they would see, not the moonlit lake but the moonlit lake as seen by us. Thus it is that people who see no beauty or attraction in the dirty street arab can feel the greatest pleasure in standing before a picture of Murillo's urchins. Such people enjoy not the appearance of the street arabs but this image of them as reflected by the sympathetic genius of the painter.

Were we to stand on a hotel veranda at sunset, with the noises of clattering dinner dishes behind us, we might not be thrilled by the sight of a sky lark soaring in the sky and the sound of his song as it comes down to us. But when we see the representation of that soaring bird in the lines of Shelley, with the poet's concentrated selection of details, and above all with his glowing words of emotion, we can not fail to be moved by what the poet sees and feels in the object of that skylark.

Those who say that imitation is not necessary in all true art, are the so called futurists in poetry and painting. These futurists are worth little consideration. Of those who realize the importance of imitation in art there are two classes of offenders, the impressionists and the ultra-realistic school. The first offend in that they carry their selection of details entirely too far. Their aim is so to narrow the selection of details as to leave with their artistic production but one, single *impression*. Hence their name. At times their work can be startlingly effective. Approaching an impressionistic painting from a

certain angle it is sometimes possible to catch a forceful impression of speed or loneliness or terror. So in an impressionistic poem we may get the single impression of whiteness or color or heat. For most impressionistic verse is sensuous. However strong this one impression may be, the work is devoid of any further merit. Unless an extremely impressionistic picture is approached under favorable circumstances it is often impossible to recognize even its solitary motif. There is never a broad play of emotions or effects such as a great work of art must always possess. Had Shakespeare been in any way an impressionist he could not have outlived his hour. It is his power of appeal, not to one class, not to one age, and not through his appeal in one emotion or theme, but to all people of all time and through the whole gamut of human feeling, that he has succeeded in surviving so many generations. An impressionistic production is a meager, poverty-stricken thing at best, and however interesting and thrilling it may be for the minute it is never something whose attractions will last.

The second class of artists who sin, even in their allegiance to the necessity of imitation and recognition, are those who reproduce with photographic exactness. Sinclair Lewis is a chronic offender. His "Main Street" has vogue among the provincial city dwellers who take smug satisfaction in doting on the supposedly rude manners of their unknown country cousins. It has also met with interest all that the gossips say about them behind their backs. But viewed strictly as a work of art, this notorious "Main Street" is hopelessly dull. Nine out of ten persons who pick the book up for no purpose other than entertainment, uninfluenced by the acclaim of literary societies or by a nose for amateurish sociology, lay the book down before they have ploughed through a hundred laborious pages. The fault of the book lies in Lewis' tiresome fondness for every detail. Edna Ferber is at times guilty of the same fault. In a serial, "The Girls," she describes an evening spent in a certain household in Chicago. It was rather a dull household and hence Miss Ferber's chapter was more than dull for it was nothing more than an exact dictophonic and cinematic reproduction of almost everything that was said and done during the evening. Fortunately not much was said. Someone asks for a ball of yarn. Another asks if the cat was put out. This is surely not art. Contrast this method with that of George Eliot, who certainly can not be accused of lacking realism. Eliot, too, describes very accurately the life of a rather dull family called Tulliver. But how interesting she makes her narrative. How she makes every detail count. And over these petty details of an unimportant family how wonderfully she manages to throw the mantle of her sympathetic understanding. She does more than relate mere details, such as the ultra-realist does; she interprets them.

RICHARD V. CARPENTER.

NAZARETH

And His Mother kept all these words in her heart.

His Mother has not told
The wonders that she knew
In Nazareth the while
Her Child to Manhood grew.

Too intimately sweet
For our unready ears
Was their companionship
Kept hidden through the years.

God has revealed Himself
But not to man is given
To know the dear delights
Of Nazareth or Heaven.

CATHERINE M. BRESNAN.

REVIEWS

Pictorial Beauty on the Screen. By VICTOR O. FREEBURG. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$2.50.

With the Movie Makers. By JOHN AMID. Boston: Lathrop, Lee and Shepherd Co. \$1.50.

Both of these volumes have to do with the production of motion pictures and both carry the underlying hope that the industry will eventually develop into something more artistic than a commercial bonanza. Beyond that, the books follow altogether different lines. Mr. Amid, who claims to have supervised nearly every branch of production, writes a popular exposition from the inside out of the manufacture of the film. While he uncovers many of the tricks of the trade, he gives due credit to the courage and the initiative of those who dare the spectacular. Mr. Amid, in his book, conducts a personally directed tour through the mysteries of the studios and lightens his description of the mechanism by many interesting tales of the makers. Mr. Freeburg's volume by way of contrast is a discussion, scholarly and complete, on the theory of the art of photography. Many there are who believe that cinematography has in it the seeds of an art not less authentic than painting and music and sculpture. With this in view, Mr. Freeburg explores the possibilities of photography and analyzes the pictorial composition of the pictures. He does not discuss the film from the viewpoint of its plot or its continuity, nor does he concern himself with its subject matter or its moral element. He contends that clear photography, to which the pictures have already attained, is but the first step in the process; there must be, in addition, other qualities that beget art, such as rhythm and unity, balance and emphasis. To obtain such perfection in each fleeting representation is indeed a meticulous process, but the lack of it will exclude the motion picture from the realm of true art. Without a fully developed sense of pictorial composition, of form and arrangement and the interplay of light and shadow, the great masters of painting could have never produced their masterpieces; a comparison of their work with the contemporaneous pictures on the screen prove that the motion picture producer has not as yet mastered his medium. But Mr. Freeburg is hopeful, since film production is still in its infancy. Such books as his blaze the trail for the genius who is to come and transform the "movies" into pure art.

A. T. P.

Motion Pictures in Education. A Practical Handbook. By DON CARLOS ELLIS and LAURA THORNBOROUGH. New York: Thomas Crowell Co. \$2.50.

Since the moving-picture is, or can be made, a valuable means of communicating thought and experience, it will sooner or later find a rightful place in the school. Teaching by the presentation of visual images has its limitations as well as its obvious advantages, but up to the present the difficulty of obtaining appro-

priate films has made their use exceedingly limited. The present volume, which seeks to extend this new field, is the work of two experienced teachers, and what may do more than anything else to recommend their venture to the conservative teacher is the almost ultra-conservative viewpoint which they adopt. They do not think that any method which they suggest will relieve the pupil from the effort of thinking or excuse him from the task of forming a taste for good literature. "Films should not be substituted for study or reading, for field or laboratory work" is the substance of a warning repeated more than once. But it is their belief that the moving-picture properly used can both stimulate thought and lead to the formation of correct literary habits. Lists of films suitable for school-use are given, together with a selected list, with addresses, of motion-picture distributors.

P. L. B.

Talks on Truth. By THOMAS HUGHES, S.J. New York: Longmans, Green and Co. \$3.00.

Since 1875 the eminent author of this volume has been making valuable contributions to the shelves of our library. His broad view of life under its manifold aspects may be judged from the various sections under which his name may be found: literature, philosophy, biology, history, pedagogy and religion. Perhaps he is best known as the author of "Loyola and the Jesuit System of Education."

In the present volume, Father Hughes calls upon a vast fund of knowledge, harnesses it to his purpose, and by invincible arguments based on rational instinct, reason, history and revelation, gives us the truth and beauty of our holy religion. One by one the various false systems of philosophy totter and fall, and with them the man-made creeds which cannot satisfy mind or heart of a God-made man.

The book is written in the form of a dialogue between master and pupil, a form commonly adopted by the Victorine School of Medieval Mysticism. Richard of St. Victor addressed two books on prayer to Benjamin Minor and Benjamin Major. So the master in this volume is St. Victor and the pupil is Benjamin. Although the author attacks the philosophical and theological heresies of our own day, he does this in the spirit of a St. Bonaventure, the Seraphic Doctor of the Mystic School and the author of "Journey of the Mind to God."

It is ardently hoped that this book may find its way into the hands of many an anxious soul who has been led astray by those who should have been the trumpeters of God's message to man. Dryden's words are even more applicable today than in his age:

The fly-blown text creates a crawling brood,
And turns to maggots what was meant for food;
A thousand daily sects rise up and die.
A thousand more the perish'd race supply.
So all we make of Heaven's discovered will
Is not to have it, or to use it ill.

J. W. K.

Scientific Method. By A. D. RITCHIE. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company.

It is well that this book carries the author's statement that he proposed to himself an examination of the methods of attaining scientific knowledge. Otherwise one would wonder why the book had been written. The author likewise professes to be both scientific and philosophical, but he can justly lay little claim to either. He states that he has found the writings of Bergson and his followers, and of certain thinkers of a Hegelian type, incomprehensible, and that he is naturally unable to criticize them. He goes on to add: "I can do no more than apologize for the fact that all their eloquence and learning leave in my mind only bewilderment and dumb hostility." The present reviewer must confess that he found bewilderment in the book, but his opposition is not of the "dumb hostility" type. Inductive reasoning, upon which so many of our laws of science rest, does not appeal to the author who is quite

vehement in his assertions that induction can never produce certitude. While all scientists will admit the utter impossibility of applying any law to all the phenomena, they would not wish to subscribe to the view expressed in this book that a law is entirely destroyed when it has been discovered that the law is not universally applicable. If we accept the universally accepted definition of a law, that it is the crystallized statement of fact, one easily sees that scientists mean that experience so far has shown no deviations beyond the limit of possible error of observation. This the author does not seem to admit. He seems to hold that an exception so militates against a law that it becomes worthless. The vast majority of us rather incline to the belief that an exception lessens the scientific value of a law; frequently an exception means a restriction in the scope of the law, with the result that the degree of certainty attaching to the application of the law is greatly increased. One can hardly tell to what so called school of philosophical thought the author belongs. At times the influence of Mill, Hume, and the Positivists is clearly discernible, while other pages have a decided tinge of Kantianism.

J. P. G.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The Moderns: XXII. Some Poets of 1923.—Because he has propounded his dictum that poets are born and not made, Horace has placed himself in a discredited school of esthetics. According to our modern way, a poet is neither born nor made; he acclaims himself poet and therefore is one. Such, at least, is the natural conclusion from an examination of L. A. G. Strong's "The Best Poems of 1923" (Small, Maynard, \$2.00). It would be tedious to quarrel with Miss Strong in her selection of the best poems of the year. Realizing that her task at best is an ungracious one, she confesses, "I sat down to please myself, and pleasure has been my test in selecting the poems assembled." From this very inconsequence, her volume merits consideration. It shows not only how exquisite modern poetry may be at its best, but also how utterly grotesque its worst may be. The anthology, like a subway train, encompasses the sinner and the saint, the beautiful and the repulsive. That, too, is the final conclusion regarding modern poetry. We have not yet passed through the phase of new discovery and fresh experiment; we are in the fluid period of a movement that must harden as did the nineteenth century innovations. Perhaps the editor of this volume did not explicitly intend it, but she has in reality mirrored our present poetic muddle. Side by side with poems that are more Victorian than Tennyson and more classical than Pope are verses that plumb to the depths the excesses of Americanism. The most individualistic of the younger intelligentsia can find in the volume a representative of his theory, whether it be imagist or futurist, impressionistic or expressionistic, rhapsodic or cerebralistic. The only omission noted is that of Gertrude Stein's school of Incomprehensibilists. Since the editor looks at America from Britain, her selection of our native poets is most interesting. Frost and Robinson, with their cold detachment, are not unworthy representatives of American poetry. But gilded Europe is quite correct in considering us barbaric if it accepts as authentic American poetry the vulgar prose of Kreymborg, and the rasping of Sandburg and Masters, the repulsive sexual degradation of much of Aiken, and the utter rowdiness of their lesser imitators. American poetry to be national must be vital and charged with energy, it must be spontaneous and near to our lives; but to be eternal poetry it must learn what beauty is and what means a noble emotion.

Fiction.—In "The Mystery Woman" (Stokes, \$2.00), Alice McGowan and Perry Newbury have written a story far above the average. It is to be commended not only for its original plot and the remarkable Irish detective who unravels it, but because it is a striking proof of the fact that writers of today can portray

life most vividly and yet have due regard for our *pueris virginibusque*.

"Treve" (Doran, \$2.00) is another fascinating story of out-of-door life by Albert Payson Terhune. Not merely does Treve himself hold our interest, but the "two partners" are characters whom it is refreshing to know. Mr. Terhune's books, which often have dogs as their principal characters, well deserve their popularity; this latest narrative adds another leaf to his laurel crown and endears him afresh to all lovers of dogs.

Even though Sherlock Holmes and Watson do masquerade under the names of Thorndyke and Jervis in "The Blue Scarab" (Dodd, Mead, \$2.00), Austin Freeman has written seven exceptionally good detective stories. Mr. Freeman supplies his detective with more advanced scientific equipment than Conan Doyle did, but the manner of solving the cases and the stupidity of the police is much the same. Altogether, the stories make good and thrilling reading.

Though they may be classified as fiction, "The Long Walk of Samba Diouf" (Duffield, \$1.75) and "The Shadow of the Cross" (Knopf, \$2.50), both by Jerome and Jean Tharaud, are in reality descriptions of social conditions in two parts of the world. The former volume narrates the manner in which the negroes in the French colonies in Africa talk and think and live. There is little plot, but the journey of Samba through the French colonies and to France, as a soldier, opens to him a new world which he tries later to describe to his African friends. "The Shadow of the Cross" is even less elaborate in plot. It is a study of the Jew in Eastern Europe. The power of the book lies in its vivid portrayal of the thoughts, the hopes, the motives and the very life of the Jew. The authors skillfully show that the history of this race has had a predominating influence on its character.

Two wrongs do not make a right. Yet the author of "The Three Stages of Clarinda Thorbald" (Dorance, \$1.90), William T. Hamilton, Jr., seems to think that they do. In this study of the waywardness of a woman's love, he has written a story that is intellectually unhealthy and morally harmful.

For the Spiritual Library.—Literature on the Holy Hour is being sought continually by the many who are growing to love more and more this beautiful devotion. Mgr. Joseph L. J. Kirlin in his book, "One Hour With Him" (Macmillan, \$1.50), offers a splendid series of meditation on the eucharistic life of Our Lord. They are suggestive of thought, broad of outline, simple in style and withal deeply spiritual. The book has many appeals; it may be used for quiet meditation, for reading circles, or by the priest for his sermonettes. While devotion to the Blessed Sacrament remains the central theme, the topics chosen for special treatment are the popular devotions, St. Joseph, the Holy Souls, the Mysteries of the Rosary and the Stations of the Cross.—"In Christ Jesus" (Benziger, \$2.35), by Rev. Raoul Plus, S.J., has already taken a high place among our ascetical books. It is now reissued in a revised and corrected edition. This is a fundamental book of spirituality and treats of the basic principle of "Incorporation with Jesus Christ," a sublime doctrine and one not generally understood. But the exposition by Father Plus, though scientific and theological, is lucid and easily comprehended in all its details. In addition to his scholarly treatment of the subject, Father Plus shows plainly how the doctrine may be translated into practical needs of daily life and prayer.—During the month of March especially, a warm welcome is tendered to "Go to Joseph. Our Unfailing Mediator" (Benziger, \$1.50), by Very Rev. Alexis M. Lepicier, O.S.M. For several years the author has been professor of theology in the College of Propaganda at Rome, and has written an exhaustive work in Latin on St. Joseph. In the abridgment of this volume, translated into English, Father Lepicier sets forth the glory of the spouse of Mary in a series of considerations on his life and virtues, with an added "example" and prayer for each day of the month.

Catholic Varia.—In order to "aid Catholics in making their assistance at Mass an act of 'rational worship,'" Rev. Joseph Boland in his book, "Of Mass" (Benziger. \$1.60), has written an admirable discussion of the Holy Sacrifice as the memorial of the Christian Pasch and Covenant. Since the book is proposed to the lay reader as an instruction in Catholic doctrine, it would have been well if matters of mere opinion had been ruled out of the discussion; but since they are introduced they should have been sharply distinguished from matters which are of certain knowledge. A popular treatise on the Mass is a difficult task to execute, but Father Boland has accomplished it well.—"Pearls from Holy Scripture" (Herder. \$1.00), by Michael J. Watson, S.J., is written for and dedicated to Catholic children. Beginning each chapter with a well selected text from the Bible, Father Watson gives a little instruction and tells an appropriate story in language that a child can easily understand. The beautiful little poems on various topics which he scatters throughout the book are suitable for memory lessons, and the aspirations appended to each chapter will teach the child an easy method of prayer.—"Oremus" (Herder. \$1.00), is a picture prayer book for very young children. It is brilliantly printed in red and black, and speaks as eloquently by its pictures as by its text. Morning and night prayers are illustrated, the various parts of the Mass are explained and pictured, and the scene of each of the mysteries of the rosary is quaintly sketched.—"Manual for Novices," published by the Brothers of the Sacred Heart, Metuchen, New Jersey, has more than a domestic interest and offers to novices of all congregations of men and women a well ordered and clearly defined outline of the duties and ideals of the religious life. The Manual is copiously illustrated by appropriate texts from Holy Scripture and by quotations from the writings of the Saints. It explains the various religious duties of the novices and suggests methods of mental and vocal prayer. In addition it gives very practical instructions on work and study and play, and shows how the spirit may draw profit from them.

Text Books.—With the spread of the practical marvels of radio, interest grows apace in the underlying principles on which the discovery is based. "The Fundamentals of Radio" (New York: Van Nostrand), by James L. Thompson, is a text book designed for this technical purpose. To understand it fully, the student must have a clear understanding of the principles of electricity, must know something of general physics and must be able to apply the formulae of mechanics. Those who are interested in the scientific, rather than the practical, phase of radio will find the book as interesting as it is valuable.—"The Teaching of Reading" (Ginn. \$1.60), by Harry G. Wheat, has been prepared for the use of normal school classes and teachers in the grammar grades. The conclusions reached by the author are the result of scientific experiment and practical experience with teachers. Hence, theory and practise are well balanced in the dissertation.—Another book for the consideration of teachers is "The Progress of Arithmetic in the Last Quarter of a Century" (Ginn. 75c.), by David E. Smith. The progress spoken of by Professor Smith is that of teaching more successfully rather than that of the development of the arithmetical science. The book is eminently practical and is a plea for modern efficiency and for the exclusion of educational faddism.—For advanced students in business courses, two late books covering much of the same ground are "Modern Business Mathematics" (American Book Company), by George Van Tuyl, and "Business Arithmetic" (Ginn. \$1.50), by George Miner, F. H. Elwell and F. C. Touton. Both books, while giving the principles and rules of Arithmetic, even from the elementary stages, place the greatest emphasis on those parts which have a special bearing on the problems that confront the business man.

Education

Peaches, Apples and Teapots

WITH perseverance worthy of a finer cause, the National Education Association labors to enlighten the public on the merits of its scheme for the creation of a Federal Department of Education. It is succeeding, too, for as time goes on, disclosing the unpleasant possibilities of the plan, the opponents of the Sterling-Reed bill multiply. Even in the ranks of the Association itself, all is not peace and harmony. Some years ago, Dean Burris of the University of Cincinnati, spoke his mind plainly and was not deterred even after the Association's well-oiled steamroller had flattened him several times. I have never met the doughty Dean, but his utterances lead me to believe that his forebears came from Donnybrook.

And the rift grows. At the recent convention of the department of superintendence in Chicago, while the bill was again approved, an intelligent and determined opposition headed by Dean Burris and Mr. Robinson G. Jones, superintendent of the Cleveland schools, made itself felt. Mr. Jones is persuaded that a Federal Department of Education, entrusted with the annual distribution of a sum which might, and probably would, reach \$100,000,000, will certainly establish a highly undesirable "Federal supervision of education." In his judgment, the Dallinger bill touches the limits beyond which it is unwise to permit the Federal Government to go. This bill, analyzed and discussed some weeks ago in AMERICA, does not provide for a Department, but co-ordinates a variety of educational interests now supervised by the Government, and in other ways seeks to elevate and strengthen the present Bureau of Education. Under the Dallinger plan, the Federal Government could offer the States "counsel and advice," yet it would be unable to control local education, for the plan does not authorize the Bureau at Washington to set educational standards for the States, and by rejecting the economically unsound "fifty-fifty" method, cuts the heart out of the Sterling-Reed scheme.

It is also significant to note how a number of prominent journals are reacting to the campaign conducted mainly by the National Education Association and the Masons of the Southern Jurisdiction. Chief among these journals are the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Louisville Post*, the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Boston Transcript*, the *Boston Globe*, the *Baltimore Evening Sun* and the *Philadelphia Record*. In an editorial appearing on February 27, the *Sun* singles out two principal grounds of opposition, the creation by the Sterling-Reed bill of an educational bureaucracy controlling the local schools, and the incompatibility of the principles on which the bill rests, with the American plan of self-government.

There are humorous aspects of the matter for those who enjoy seeing the tax-payer bilked for the benefit of the uplift lobby. But there are serious aspects as well. The bill which carries this munificent annual appropriation of \$100,000,000 is another aspect

of the State-aid legislation which is the chief support of the uplifters in this their era. The money will be spent in those States which are willing to yield to Federal dictation in the matter of education. Either you do as the Washington bureaucrats direct, or you don't get your share of the pie.

Pleasant prospect for those who still believe that there is some worth in the traditional American doctrine of local self-government and individual liberty!

On February 28, during the Chicago convention, the editor of the Chicago *Tribune* discussed the same topic. While what he wrote has appeared in one form or other in AMERICA ever since October, 1918, the editorial is interesting as showing the degree to which disapproval of the bill has grown.

The bill is a thoroughly conventional bit of paternalistic legislation designed, as so much legislation nowadays is designed, to further centralization of government in Washington, to relieve various sections of the country of responsibility for their own advancement, and to that extent to retard local initiative and local self-government. Inasmuch as it would appropriate a Federal subsidy of \$100,000,000 to this end, and divide it among the States which would match the fund dollar for dollar . . . it is only natural that a majority of professional educators should favor it, especially as it promises to give one of them, eventually, a place in the President's Cabinet, with a great army of bureaus and minor departments under his command.

But that is not a sufficient reason for the approval of such a bill. Certainly, it is not the reason advanced. The argument in favor of the bill is chiefly that of need of means for dragging backward districts up to the level of educationally advanced districts. Its sponsors fail to see in this the danger of dragging some advanced districts down toward the level of the backward districts. Theoretically, the bill is one for the equalization of educational facilities on a higher plane for all. Its sponsors fail to note that out of diversity come the highest developments of civilization, and that any effort to bring all the various mentalities of the country to one level of opportunity is a menace to the more progressive communities.

To be sure, the bill provides that the Secretary of Education shall exercise no authority over the educational facilities encouraged under the act in the various States, but if there is to be such an official at all, that provision appears absurd on its face.

This is true; but the fact is that in three distinct sections the bill itself lays a firm foundation for Federal control. By section 9, the Federal Government is empowered to exact certain educational standards. Whether these standards are good or bad is immaterial; the vital issue is the admission that Congress can establish standards to which the States must conform under penalty. Section 16 authorizes the Secretary to discontinue all Federal payments if a State neglects or refuses to submit an annual report, and if the bill means anything at all, if a report actually filed does not meet the Secretary's approval. Finally section 14 provides that in case of dispute with regard to the meaning of the act or to the use of moneys appropriated under the act, decision shall rest not with the State but with the Federal Government. These sections plainly authorize a Federal control that can be made absolute.

The precedent will be bad. From such a precedent we may expect legislation eventually to prescribe not only that all children

shall go to school, but what school they shall go to, and what they shall study when they get there.

The bill strikes very subtly at one of the fundamentals of life—at the family, and at the parental duty and prerogative of rearing the child in the way he should go. It does so under the guise of giving the States something for nothing. That is false on its face. Every cent which would be distributed under the bill would come out of the pockets of the tax-payers, just as the equal amounts contributed by the States would do. But worst of all is the fact that it would further centralize government in Washington and extend bureaucracy.

Subtle, indeed, was my suggestion that the Sterling-Reed plan might be relied upon to supply every little red school-house in the country with a nice new teapot, or, at least, with a tea-ball. For after all do we not spend more than one billion dollars a year on our schools? Let us not speak of "graft" in connection with public education; the term is in the discard. The modern method is to borrow a cipher, and then use such noun-substantives as peaches, apples and teapots. They all mean the same thing.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S. J.

Sociology

Oil and the Cooperative Movement

THE Tea Pot Dome scandal unfolds amazing and complete proof of the alliance between politicians and business men. The alliance has long been suspected. Careful onlookers have long realized it. Hints here and there, evidence appearing at most unsuspected times, the formal planks of political platforms, the actions of politicians, the calm assumptions of business men combined long since to make clear. But it had not been dramatized in recent years. We now recollect what this or that politician did, and we understand it better. We are reminded that it has been assumed all along that business men have a certain title to the Government. We are nauseated at the revelations, but we are clearer-brained for it.

We have not concluded, however, that all politicians stand hand in glove with the ruling powers of the business world. Many are honest and upright and anxious to do what they can within the limits of our day and age for the material welfare of the masses of the people. We have not affirmed, now that our eyes are opened, that business men get all that they want. Nor have we come to the conclusion that liberty bonds and a bag of money are common incidents of the politico-business alliance. No such thoughts have entered our minds. It is not so simple as that. All politicians do not look upon the prosperity of business men as the first consideration in government. Politicians, moreover, we know, have purposes of their own which they must secure. They must get re-elected, for one thing. They must keep somewhere within the bounds of the legal system on nearly all occasions. They

must arbitrate between various business interests. They must placate the discontented. They must keep up a semblance of governing for the people. They must satisfy within limits the demands which their own conscience places upon them when their conscience is stubborn. Moreover, they must ordinarily preserve several nice distinctions. They must distinguish between receiving money for their own private purse and receiving it for their political campaigns or the campaigns of their party. They must distinguish between taking money directly in the form of a plain unadorned bribe, and taking it in the form of a loan, a salary, a legal fee, as profits from stock, or as special privileges in business undertakings.

It is all exceedingly complicated. But the main point is clear enough, and appears *a priori* true. Given an economic system in which one class of men stand in positions of power. Given a government which can help or harm the men in control of the economic system. Given, furthermore, the general assumption that the men who control the economic system are among our most useful citizens and their aims and practises eminently praiseworthy. The result follows as day the night. The Tea Pot Dome scandal is merely a case in which a certain official, so it is charged and widely believed, transcended the ordinary bounds. He did something against the law; he received money from those whom he helped; and what he did was particularly aggravating in that the property he leased to a private company was to be reserved for future use by the navy. But if it exceeds the ordinary limits of the alliance between business and politics, it serves to bring out with startling distinctness the fact itself. There is an alliance. It is an alliance that has rules of its own. The Tea Pot Dome scandal, so it appears, breaks those rules. But the alliance exists and has existed.

It is a natural alliance. It is based upon the existing economic system. The assumption is accepted that business men and financiers are the natural guardians of the people's prosperity. They own a large part of industry, banking and trade. What they do not own, they control, almost completely, so that nearly all our economic system is in their hands. The material welfare of the rest of the people and all that follows upon it are to trickle first through the hands of those who are in control of the economic system. Since government is established for the material welfare of the people, then the first consideration of government, according to this view, is to see to it that these fountains from which all prosperity flows shall be carefully cared for. Why not then a politico-business alliance? It would be a marvel if there were none.

It happens just now that large numbers of the people are contesting the basis of this politico-business alliance. They are contesting the power of the business men to control prosperity and distribute it to other sections of the population as they see fit or as they are grudgingly forced. Farmers are trying to control their own marketing. Labor is asking and at times securing, a place in the

management of industry. Labor has invaded banking. City consumers here and there have entered upon the field of trade. All this is in its infancy, but it gives promise of great growth in the next few years. At this critical moment, there appears in view the oil-burning Tea Pot and the question arises what effect will it have upon these cooperative organizations of farmers, city workingmen and the city consumers.

The Tea Pot Dome proves that an alliance exists between politicians and business men. One conclusion from this runs in this fashion: Business men are the guardians and fountains of the material welfare of the people because they have been shrewd enough to control government; therefore, if we who do not like others to control our material welfare or who believe that our material welfare is not being conceded us by the business men, get control of the government we will control our own material welfare.

This argument is wrong. Business men are the more prosperous and the more firmly established because they control the government. But they control the government now because they are prosperous in their own right and title as manufacturers, bankers and traders. The alliance between politicians and business men is based upon the mutual advantage to each of such an alliance. But beneath it all there lies the fact that material welfare, such as it is, does as a matter of fact flow down to the people through the hands of the business men. To contest the politico-business alliance is not the most important step. The first requisite is for farmers, city workingmen and city consumers to contest business men's economic control of prosperity through the establishment of their own cooperative organizations.

It is not that they can expect nothing from the politicians until they do this. It is rather that whatever help they get from the government will be inadequate unless they have the strength of mutual aid in their agricultural, industrial, banking and trade cooperatives. The people can choose their government, but they will find that their government cannot do everything. What was shown in Russia when communism was attempted, applies equally to government action anywhere, regardless of the economic system that the people might wish politicians to introduce. Politicians come finally to the end of their rope. However they get their power, whether by election or revolution, they meet the same set of facts. They cannot help the people very much unless the people are able to help themselves. If the people have not the economic capacity and a foundation of knowledge and experience to manage their own economic affairs, then politicians, whatever their views, must turn in their search for the public welfare to those who have this capacity, knowledge and experience. In other words, they fall back upon the business men, financiers and traders and content themselves with protecting the masses of the people from the rapacity of the grossly unscrupulous or at best with trying to edu-

cate the people up to the point at which they can take control of their own economic conditions. And there is no substitute for self-aid.

There is a temptation in such times as these to overestimate the importance of government, and underestimate the independent importance in its own right of the overshadowing and underlying industrial and financial system. There is a temptation to think that it is all merely a question of government. The Tea Pot Dome case does not indicate mere political corruption or show merely that politicians and business men are in alliance. There is a fact behind this alliance which causes the alliance. That fact is the most important of the whole question. It is the economic power of business men. This power is not to be victoriously contested merely by political measures nor is the alliance between politicians and business men to be overthrown merely by a political election. The farmers, city workingmen and city consumers must secure economic power for themselves if they are to use their government continuously and normally for their own welfare. To establish a partnership with public officials, that is to say, to secure the ordinary help of the government they need to do more than vote. They need to sit in seats of authority in the economic system. When the economic system is democratic and power is widely distributed to men in their capacity as workers and consumers of goods, then the political system also will be for the people and by the people.

It becomes a matter of great moment whether the Tea Pot Dome scandal will set the fires burning brighter under the cooperative movement, or whether it will blaze up only in a political movement. Will the Tea Pot Dome scandal show farmers, city working people and consumers that the prime requisite of their having a government that will act for their benefit, is for them to secure cooperative control of their economic activities? Or will they see merely the alleged bribery and illegality of the oil episode? Will it be only a question of their trying to secure public officials who are not scoundrels? Will they stop at the knowledge that this is an outstanding though abnormal example, whether anyone is guilty of crime or not, of the normal every-day alliance between business men and politicians?

Or having seen that such an alliance exists, will they themselves change, as far as they can, the underlying economic system upon which the alliance is based, and create for themselves cooperatively a position of responsibility? Will the turmoil all be shunted off into a political election, or will it arouse among farmers, among city working people and among city consumers the conviction that they must build their co-operative movement deep and strong? It is too early to answer this question, but if the masses of the people on the farms and in the cities decide only upon a political movement, they will set themselves back many years.

R. A. MCGOWAN.

Note and Comment

Catholic Churches
and the Worker

A VALUABLE testimony was given to the Catholic Church by Warren S. Stone, President of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, when speaking on February 29 before the Council of Cities of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Prefacing his remarks by saying that he was a Protestant, a member of the Congregational Church, and that he spoke "more in a spirit of sorrow and sadness" than in a critical or cynical mood, he continued:

The workingman is no longer welcome in many of our Protestant churches, and the workingman clothed in rags has no place where he is welcome in any of the Protestant churches. The reverse is true of the Catholic Church. No matter how lowly his position in the social scale, no matter how ragged he may be, the doors of the church always stand open to him.

You want to know what labor thinks of the Church. I tell you very frankly that labor does not think much of the Church because the Church does not think very much of labor. Always in any trouble between capital and labor the influence of the Church has largely been on the side of capital. This is easily explained when you realize that the Church depends upon capital for its support and not upon contributions from the workers.

It rests with those who are looked upon as representing the Catholic Church in America to make plain, by practise rather than by words, that no justified accusation of partiality for wealth and capital can ever be brought against them.

Vocation Week and
Vocation Month

THE editor of *Hospital Progress* states that the number of Sisters engaged at the present time in hospital work throughout the United States and Canada is about 20,000.

The bed capacity of all the Sisters' general hospitals in the United States and Canada is more than half the bed capacity of all the hospitals conducted by those of other religious denominations and by lay organizations, as well as by States, cities and counties. The demand is so great for Sisters in hospitals and in schools as teachers that twice the number of Sisters could well be used in the work now being done, and in the growing demand for other institutions conducted by Sisters. Over four millions of people pass through these general hospitals of the Sisters every year. 70,000 of the medical profession are on the staffs in these hospitals. About 25,000 lay nurses are receiving instruction in the nursing schools attached to the Sisters' hospitals. Between 700 and 800 chaplains administer to the spiritual wants of the patients in the Sisters' hospitals.

While this indeed is a glorious record, it also put before us a tremendous problem. As the writer says, twice the number of Sisters now at work in our social and educational work are actually needed. The number of our teaching Sisters he rates as between 70,000 and 80,000, yet if our watchword is made effective, "Every Catholic child in a Catholic school," we shall need double this number. In other fields, too, there is need for Sisters, in orphan asylums, homes for the aged, and countless

similar institutions of Christian charity. Hence the need of praying for vocations and the timeliness of the Crusade for Vocations promoted by the Catholic Hospital Association, which has sent out circulars to the clergy and to all the Sisters' institutions advocating a Vocation Week to begin with the first Sunday in May and asking that in fact the entire month of May be set aside particularly as "a month of prayer for vocations."

Report of International Mission Council

THE first report of the General Council at Rome of the Propagation of the Faith has just been issued. It shows a total receipt of 34,189,519 lire, and disbursements of almost the same amount. Pope Pius XI himself contributed 500,000 lire. The following countries passed the million mark in their total donations to the Propagation of the Faith: The United States, 10,496,766; France, 5,144,263; England and Scotland, 1,663,349, and the Argentine, 1,040,955. It is somewhat invidious to make these selections out of the long list of countries, large and small, which have each contributed a share, not excepting impoverished Germany, Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland and even Russia. About the same time the Annual Report of the New York branch of the Society has reached us, with a total of net contributions from the archdiocese of New York to the Catholic foreign missions and the Society for the Propagation of the Faith amounting to \$297,484.22. The gross receipts were \$323,979.85.

Our Negro Mission Field

IN the *African Missionary*, which has now taken the place of the *Colored Claim*, the Negro population of the entire earth is set at 200,000,000 or one-eighth of the population of the globe. While Africa is their homeland, about 25,000,000 of the colored race are now settled, "by a freak of history," in the Western hemisphere. A large proportion of these are in the United States. They are "aliens," says the editor, "just as President Coolidge is. They have no particular reason to be proud of the fact that in point of time they arrived here about the same time as the Pilgrim Fathers." But far more surely than the descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers, they came to stay. Our own work among these colored people has now been seriously taken in hand, yet here is a thought to give us pause:

Looking at the situation from a wider angle, we find that the number of colored Catholics, in proportion to the total Negro population, has declined since the days of emancipation. At the close of the Civil War in 1865, Catholic Negroes numbered about 200,000, i.e., a little over four per cent of the total colored population of 4,500,000. Today the Negro population is about 12,000,000, whilst colored Catholics total at most 250,000, i.e., only about two per cent of the total Negro population. Negro Catholicism has not kept pace with Negro growth.

What we have done in recent years is a gratifying achievement, yet "it is a mere pittance when we consider the million-dollar appropriations of single Protestant denominations." All this is said not to discourage us but rather to stimulate our zeal. The fact is that we are now progressing. Two seminaries have already been organized in the States for the education of Negro youths to the holy priesthood: St. Anthony's Mission House, Highwood, New Jersey, in charge of the Fathers of the African Mission Society, and St. Augustine's Mission House, Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, in charge of the Society of the Divine Word. This should prove to be the beginning of a new era in our Catholic Negro mission work.

The Proscribed Classes in New York State

A PAMPHLET issued by Congressman R. B. Creager of Texas, arraigning the Ku Klux Klan and advising fellow members of the Republican National Committee to take a strong stand against it, is accompanied by a slip containing a rather interesting list of the proscribed classes in New York State. The table shows that 7,785,873 inhabitants out of a total population of 10,385,227 of that unfortunate State will have to be extirpated and exterminated by the Klan. To have undertaken such a Herculean task is sufficient evidence of its heroic patriotism.

1. Total population	10,385,227
2. Number of Catholics (1916)	2,745,552
3. Number of Jews (No authentic data)	
4. Number of Negroes	198,483
5. Number of foreign born	2,825,375
6. Number of persons of foreign parentage (Both parents of foreign birth)	2,844,083
7. Number of persons of mixed parentage. (One parent of foreign birth)	873,566
8. Total	9,487,059
9. Attention is called to the fact that the number of Catholics shown in line 2 undoubtedly includes part of the foreign born and those of foreign and mixed parentage in lines 5, 6 and 7. There is thus an "overlap" of the figures given in line 2 on those given in lines 5, 6 and 7.	
The percentage of Catholics to total population is practically 26%. Presuming this percentage to hold approximately true as to the classes listed in lines 5, 6 and 7, there should be deducted from the total shown in line 8, 26% of the figures shown in lines 5, 6 and 7. Subtract	1,701,186
10. Total in proscribed classes held by Ku Klux Klan to be less than 100% American	7,785,873

We apologize for our existence and are sorry for the sake of the Klan. In reprinting the above list the *American Israelite* gives the number of Jews in New York State, left undetermined above, as approximately 3,500,000. The other figures are from the last religious census, 1916, and the general census, 1920.